DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 917 95 TM 007 251

AUTHOR Geiser, Kenneth R.
TITLE A Feasibility Assessment of the Study of Follow Through Parent and Teacher Effects. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Huron Inst., Cambridge, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 76
CONTRACT OEC-0-74-0394
NOTE 125p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Observation Techniques; Compensatory Education Programs; Early Childhood Education; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Feasibility Studies; *Field Studies; *Parent Participation; *Parent Reaction; Parent School Relationship; Parent Teacher Cooperation; Policy Formation; *Politics; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS *Project Follow Through; Unobtrusive Measures

ABSTRACT

There were two major objectives to this feasibility study: to explore the range of possible effects of Project Follow Through on parents and on teachers, and to review various models of investigating the nature of these effects. Comparatively little previous research has involved effects on parents and teachers although the original legislation was designed to guarantee parent involvement; but anecdotal data suggest the effects on parents have sometimes been dramatic. Two general models are considered: the rationalized research approach, and a study of the records of political and policy-relevant behavior of parents and teachers. Research methodologies have included surveys, classroom observations, the use of unobtrusvie measures, and field studies. These approaches are considered with respect to their generalizability, comparability, validity, reliability, cost and policy relevance. Finally, the political behavior approach is discussed and recommended because it views individuals holistically, emphasizes utility and policy relevance, and appears to be cost-effective. An Appendix provides information about the results of three previous field studies. (CTM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED157917

Final Report

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM | PS
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

# A FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT OF THE STUDY OF FOLLOW THROUGH PARENT AND TEACHER EFFECTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Kenneth R. Geiser

August 1976

The Huron Institute
119 Mt. Auburn Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Prepared for:
The Office of Education
Follow Through Evaluation Branch
Contract No. OEC-0-74-0394

TM007 251

FOLLOW THROUGH PARENT AND TEACHER EFFECTS STUDY

Contents


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| A. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| B. | ORGANIZATION OF STUDY | 3 |
| 1.0 | BACKGROUND | 6 |
| | 1.1 Federal Intentions | 6 |
| | 1.2 Program Characteristics | 9 |
| | 1.3 Parent and Teacher Characteristics | 11 |
| 2.0 | THE SURVEY APPROACH | 13 |
| | 2.1 The National Evaluation | 13 |
| | A. The NORC Parent Survey | 14 |
| | B. The 1973 SRI Analysis | 17 |
| | C. The 1974 Abt Analysis | 20 |
| | D. The 1975 SRI Cross Tabular Analysis | 25 |
| | E. Summary | 26 |
| | 2.2 Sponsor and Site Evaluations | 29 |
| 3.0 | THE CLASSROOM OBSERVATION APPROACH | 35 |
| 4.0 | THE UNOBTRUSIVE MEASURES APPROACH | 39 |
| 5.0 | THE FIELD STUDY APPROACH | 42 |
| | 5.1 The SRI Community Studies | 42 |
| | 5.2 The Huron Field Study | 45 |
| 6.0 | REVIEW OF PREVIOUS APPROACHES | 59 |
| | 6.1 Criteria of Assessment | 59 |
| | 6.2 Review by Criteria | 61 |
| | A. Generalizability | 61 |
| | B. Comparability | 64 |
| | C. Validity and Reliability | 66 |
| | D. Cost | 70 |
| | E. Policy Relevance | 71 |

7.0 THE POLITICAL BEHAVIOR APPROACH 75

7.1 The Huron Political Behavior Study 76
7.2 Political Behavior at the Local Level 77
7.3 Political Behavior at the National Level 82
7.4 Review of Political Behavior Approach 91

8.0 CONCLUSIONS: PARENT AND TEACHER EFFECTS 94

APPDENDIX: FIELD REPORTS FOR HURON FIELD STUDY -101

A. INTRODUCTION

Many observers of the Follow Through program in early childhood education have remarked upon the program's effects upon the lives of parents as well as children and upon the professional practice of teachers. It is not surprising. Parents have long been seen as direct recipients of some program services and teachers are the front line agents in the delivery of the service. Various field researchers have returned from their interviews with dramatic stories of parents who report remarkable changes in their life style and personal development due to their experiences with Follow Through. At national conferences and local workshops both parents and teachers offer extensive testimony as to changes in their relationships with school systems, the classroom and the early years of a child's education. The popularity of the program among parents and teachers as presented in community newspapers, in school board meetings and at other civic gatherings suggests further evidence of effects.

Each year as the budget for Follow Through comes up for congressional approval it is noted that a large outpouring of political support becomes evident among Congressmen. If Congressmen support the program, so goes the logic, they must sense that the popularity of the program among their constituents results from actual benefits which parents and teachers receive from participating in the program.

The early years of the Follow Through evaluation witnessed several efforts to study parent and teacher participation in the program. Much of the early effort was curtailed during the 1971 reorganization of the evaluation. Little was left of these early

efforts except the annual parent and teacher surveys. Over the years since then interest in the role of parents and teachers has waxed and waned on a marginal basis, mostly in sympathy with the interests of evaluation administrators at the Office of Education. Yet, except for one brief effort in 1972, little formal attention has been directed toward parents and teachers as separate and independent focii of the national evaluation.

The Follow Through program has been centrally directed at improving (or maintaining the improvement of) the performance of a certain target population of children. Child effects rightfully stand at the center of the program evaluation. Still the numerous anecdotes generated during the implmentation of the evaluation have suggested that many other program participants have benefitted from Follow Through. Some of these, particularly the evaluation contractors, the consulting sponsors, the specific school systems, the participating teachers, and the health, psychiatric and special educaton professionals have clearly benefited in their roles as agents in the delivery of Follow Through services. Yet one group in particular, parents, have benefited directly as recipients of program services. In fact, the original federal guidelines specifically designated that parents should be seen as the final recipients of some program services.* Thus parents could benefit from Follow Through in two roles--as final recipients of services or, like teachers, as agents of the service delivery to children.

---

* See this report, Section 1.1.

While at various times over the duration of the evaluation, field anecdotes have sparked an interest in just what benefits have occurred to program participants other than children, the evaluation has remained primarily focused on child effects. In part this stemmed from the lack of a clear understanding about how such benefits could be elicited, categorized and assessed. Just what is the range of benefits that parents or teachers might receive? How can research methods be used to elicit and compare such effects? Are there parent or teacher effects broad enough and substantial enough to be worth evaluation? Do parents and teachers actively support Follow Through? If so, do they support Follow Through because of benefits they perceive and, if so, what are these benefits? It is toward these questions that this study is directed.

## B. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This study is a feasibility study and not a full scale inquiry. It considers the potentials for further study. There are two objectives: 1) to explore the range of possible effects of Follow Through on parents and teachers and 2) to review various models of investigating the nature of these effects. This study will consider two general models for assessing the program's effects. One is the rationalized research approach which attempts to objectively identify a specific list of effects as changes in the attributes of the parents and teachers under study. A second model of assessment is here examined which attempts to record the political and policy-

relevant behavior of parents and teachers in the program. Instead of a differentiated list of well detailed attributes, this model reveals a more global unity of effect.

The two objectives for the study are actually quite interdependent: efforts toward one involve efforts toward the other. Therefore, in considering each of the research approaches reviewed here, the various results of their application will also be presented. Four approaches will be considered. First, the ongoing national evaluation survey efforts will be considered. The review will cover the history and results of the national parents interview and the teacher and teacher aide self administered questionnaires. Second the classroom observation methods developed in the national evaluation for exploring child-teacher interactions will be considered as a vehicle for eliciting teacher effects. Third, the value of the unobtrusive measures approach will be considered, with a review of the 1972 Huron Institute feasibility study of parent effects. Fourth, the unstructured field studies will be reviewed by considering the early national evalution community studies and a separate field study conducted under this feasibility study.

Each of these research approaches will then be reviewed comparatively as they relate to a set of criteria developed in consideration of the special character of the Follow Through Program. In section 7.0 this review will then turn to the second mode of program assessment: the political impact

study. Here the efforts of parents and teachers to effect policy at both the local and national level will be considered and reviewed in terms of understanding parent and teacher effects.

The first section, which immediately follows, provides background information concerning the federal objectives of the program, the program as it actually has been implemented and some characteristics of the parents and teachers who participated. The section which concludes this report provides an overall summary and general conclusions.

## 1.0 BACKGROUND

Follow Through has in many ways been a unique program and its particular approach to parents and teachers has relevance to the methods used to study it. The three sections which follow consider the particular character of the program in regard to its objectives toward parents and teachers, its implemented involvement with parents and teachers, and the characteristics of those parents and teachers who did become involved.

### 1.1 Federal Intentions

The Follow Through program was conceived in 1967 as a social service program designed to aid in the education of low income children. The program was mandated by Congress in December of 1967 in amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Thus several sections of the original legislation are directed toward guaranteeing parent involvement. Throughout the legislation no mention is made of the character of teacher involvement. While the primary focus of Follow Through benefits were clearly intended for children, parents were also considered as more than merely a means.

For instance, the Follow Through Program Manual (February 24, 1969 - Draft) calls for "the direct participation of the parents of Follow Through children in the development, conduct and overall direction of the project. 1/ Defining parent participation under the ideology of community action the guidelines go on to require "four major kinds of parent pariticipation."

a. "Participation in the policy making process of administering the local Follow Through project." To implement this "kind of participation" the guidelines mandate the establishment of local Policy Advisory Committees (PAC's). The PAC which must be at least half parents is required to "play a substantial role in the planning and management of the Follow Through project." The guidelines also suggest the establishment of "other parent groups" more directly concerned with instructional issues. The general thrust of this requirement appears to be accountability. The local community and the federal government is to be assured that the local projects are accountable to (though not controlled by) some parents. The central focus here is upon the quality of the program and its acceptability in the community and not upon the parents.

b. "Participation in the classroom and school as paid employees, volunteers or observers." Specifically it is required that parents be given preference in the hiring of non-professionals. Further it is suggested that parents be given opportunities to observe and volunteer. The intentions here are to aid teachers in communicating with parents, show children the depth of parent interest and enable parents to better understand their children and their children's needs. The objective here seems to be to bridge the gap between instruction efforts and parental understanding and support by drawing the parents

1/ U.S. Office of Education, Follow Through Office, Follow Through Program Manual, Draft Version, Washington D.C., February 24, 1969. p. ii.

into the classroom. Parents are seen as a means to this end; i.e., parents-as-agents. It is not suggested that parents might benefit themselves by classroom presence or income supplements.

c. "Participation via regular home contact between parents and Follow Through staff." The objective here appears to center upon integrating the spatial home environment and classroom environment. The staff is pressed to penetrate into the parents' domestic life space with educational and child development issues. This requirement inverts the previous one by drawing the teacher into the home. Again the requirement appears focused upon parents only in order to improve the delivery of Follow Through services to the child. Non-child focused parent benefits are secondary.

d. "Participation through parent-focused educational and community activities." Parents are to plan and engage in activities and assistances which are responsive to their own needs. Of all four requirements this one alone focuses principally upon benefits to parents not as a means but directly as an end. It is clearly assumed that benefits to parents will have secondary effects upon children, but the focus is clearly upon parents as final recipients.

In 1974 the Follow Through program was re-authorized under Title V of the Community Services Act. Parent participation was retained as a requirement of the legislation.[2/] Yet, much less is said about parent participation

---

2/ Section 551 (a)(3) reads, "Such projects shall provide for the direct participation of the parents of such children in the development, conduct, and overall direction of the program at the local level." Public Law 93-644 (88 Stat. 2307), January 4, 1975.

in the 1975 regulations.[3] The four requirements defining parent participation in the 1969 guidelines are yet noted, but not delineated. The Policy Advisory Committee yet serves as the primary focus of parent participation, and it has been expanded to include a Career Development Committee for aid in selecting, guiding, and monitoring the development of the non-professional staff members who are preferentially parents. Objective 4, which does mandate at least some concern for services directly to parents, is retained in this 1975 update.

In summary, parent participation in the Follow Through program remained an important element in the federal intentions for planning and maintenance of the programs. Generally, this participation was seen as a means to achieving or guaranteeing the instructional objectives of Follow Through, but at least one specific statement was made requiring that Follow Through parents be regarded as a service target directly. No requirements were established for guaranteeing teacher benefits.

1.2 Program Characteristics

By 1974, Follow Through programs had been implemented at some 170 sites across the nation from Hawaii to Maine. These sites were distributed among 22 different sponsors as well as some 16 sites which were self-sponsored.[4] The degree to which sponsors emphasized parent participation and teacher training varies greatly, as does the actual implementation

---

[3] Rules and Regulation, Part 158 (Follow Through Program) of Title 45, Chapter 1 as recorded in the Federal Register, vol. 40, no. 77 (April 21, 1975).

[4] Marvin G. Cline et al., Education as Experimentation: Evaluation of the Follow Through Planned Variation Model, Final Report, Two Volumes, Cambridge: Abt Associates, March, 1974. Hereafter referred to as "1974 Abt Report".

of parent participation and teacher training at the individual site levels. [5]

The Follow Through program has been implemented at the sites through the interaction of several institutions and organizations. In order for the public schools to participate in Follow Through, they must designate special classrooms which are under the direction of a special project director and under the technical guidance of a "program sponsor" responsible for implementing a particular experimental, educational approach in the classroom. Follow Through teachers receive special training and technical assistance from sponsors and special supplementary aides from allied health and psychological professionals. Training for teachers may include in-service workshops, summer institutes, or classroom supervision. In addition, Follow Through teachers have access to supplemental funds for field trips, supplies, and other curriculum expenses. The amount of training, extra funds, and supervision varies considerably by sponsor and site. The opportunities for the participation of parents also varies greatly by sponsor and site. Generally, though, parents may participate in Follow Through in any of five ways. First, they may be hired as teaching aides in the classroom, in which case they receive training from the sponsors and special support in continuing their formal education. Second, they may be hired as special staff assistants or provided small part-time work such as bus monitors, recreation assistants, etc. Third, they may be elected or appointed to sit on the Policy Advisory Committees

---

[5] For a more detailed report of such implementation differences, see 1974 Abt Report, Vol. II. For a detailed study of one site. see Anne Monaghan's study of program implementation, Huron Institute, forthcoming, August, 1976.

in which case they may serve on committees which review some program policy and expenses. Fourth, they may participate in various parent oriented classes or social activities which may include anything from child development classes to sewing and cooking classes, to bowling leagues, to field trips. Fifth, they may informally drop in on on-going Follow Through classes to observe or participate as classroom volunteers.

1.3 Parent and Teacher Characteristics

Follow Through has been directed at low-income families. The children of middle-income families are included in many Follow Through classrooms, but, in general, the parents participating in Follow Through programs live on less than middle level incomes. The median income of parents reported upon in the 1974 Abt Report ranged by sponsor from $8,200 to $5,100.[6/] In the case of each of the sponsors covered in this report, the median reported income of Follow Through parents was lower than for Non-Follow Through parents. Overall, the Follow Through parents also reported a lower educational attainment level, as indicated by proportion of mothers completing high school, than did the Non-Follow Through populations, although there was considerable variability reported by sponsor.

Teacher selection in Follow Through has varied greatly by site. In some sites parent screening committees have been highly influential

---

6/ 1974 Abt Report Vol. IB, p. I-50.

in determining who is hired, while in other cases the project director provides critical influence, and, in still other sites, the selection is heavily determined by the conventional hiring practices of the local school system. Thus, in some cases, Follow Through teachers are a specially selected group, quite different from the traditional school staff, and, in other cases, they are quite similar. Generally, where Follow Through teachers are selected via a special program process, their distinctions as a group may be more marked, although even where standard selection channels are employed, school personnel may look for special characteristics in Follow Through candidates that they would not generally look for in regular teachers. 7/

Whatever the mechanics by which Follow Through teachers are selected, their distinctiveness is enough to appear within the national analysis. The 1974 Abt report notes that, nationally, Follow Through teachers tend to be younger, somewhat less experienced, and slightly newer to their current school assignment than Non-Follow Through teachers. On the average, they are in their mid-thirties, have over nine years of teaching experience, and over five years experience in their current school. 8/ Generally, Follow Through teachers have the same educational attainment but slightly lower salaries (probably reflecting the difference in experience) than Non-Follow Through teachers. While there are some significant variations by sponsor and geographic area, Follow Through teachers are more likely to be of a minority background and to reside in the local school neighborhood or similar neighborhood than are their Non-Follow Through colleagues.

---

7/ Such differences were noted by all three project directors interviewed in the field study as well as the one school principal interviewed.

8/ See Abt Report, 1974, p. II-27.

## 2.0 THE SURVEY APPROACH

The major source of information on parents and teachers in Follow Through comes from the annual national surveys conducted under the aegis of the National Evaluation.* It would be propitious if some or all of this information could be used in addressing this study. A quick review of the material reveals a major limit. Most of the consideration given parents and teachers in the national evaluation treats them as mediators in analyses focused upon child effects. Seldom has the evaluation turned to focus directly upon parents or teachers as recipients of effects as an end in itself. For most studies, this was not even an implicit objective. This insight in itself is not enough to negate the value of these studies for considering parent and teacher effects. But, in fairness to the studies, it is important to keep it in mind. While this limitation is relevant to ascertaining specific effects, it does not limit the value of these surveys in assessing the virtues of the approach.

### 2.1 The National Evaluation

The Follow Through program was envisioned by many as a broad national experiment whereby large amounts of data on various curriculum models for early childhood education would be collected and analyzed. The first contract for this massive research effort went to the Stanford Research Institute. SRI commenced its effort with a rather broad definition of the evaluation. Not only did SRI originally collect data on child effects, it also

*Relevant method references to survey research techniques can be found in Herbert Hyman, Survey Design and Analysis (Glencoe: Free Press, 1955), Leslie Kish, Survey Sampling (New York: J. Wiley, 1965) and Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement (New York. David McKay, 1964).

focused upon process issues such as classroom observations and case studies of the institutional changes that resulted from Follow Through's introduction into the schools and other outcome issues such as the effects of Follow Through on teachers, parents, teacher aides and other project personnel. Much of this early effort is now viewed in retrospect as rather loose, exploratory and undirected, yet these early evaluation efforts did lay the ground work for the ongoing collection of survey data which has continued to the present day upon parents, teachers and teacher aides.

A. The NORC Parent Survey

During the early years of the data collection SRI contracted with the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) to carry out the parent surveys. This relationship has been maintained throughout the data collection. In the 1973 Technical Report SRI claimed that this survey provided "the primary source of evidence for assessment of program impact on parent, home and community factors." 9/

While the administration of the survey was sub-contracted to NORC, the responsibility for the design and development of the instrument and the site and parent selection remained with SRI. During the winter of 1968, SRI, in conjunction with the Office of Education and various consultants, developed a structured interview guide which was intended to be administered by NORC trained interviewers upon a national sample of

9/ John A. Emrick et al., Interim Evaluation of the National Follow Through Program, 1969-1971: A Technical Report, Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, February, 1973. Hereafter referred to as the "1973 SRI Report".

Follow Through and Non-Follow Through parents. Parents, preferably the mothers, were to be interviewed in the year that their children entered kindergarten and the year their children left third grade to provide some temporal comparison. The interviews were to be conducted in the early spring of each year.

During the following year, the parent interview guide went through a series of six revisions which included a pre-test in Racine, Wisconsin. Finally, by early 1970, all approvals and clearances were acquired and the first administration was carried out.[10/] This first parent survey was administered to parents of cohort I children who were at the time in kindergarten. Data was compiled from nearly 9,000 interviews. This sample was drawn from lists of households provided to NORC by sponsors. All households were interviewed in sites with 110 or less households and random selection was used at sites with over 110 potential contacts.

A second administration of the parent survey was conducted in fall, 1970, and thereafter a pattern of spring and fall administrations was maintained at least up to 1972.

In the spring of 1971, the instrument was greatly revised. In the first administration, a long and a short form of interview guides were used. After 1971, one medium length instrument was used which contained attitudinal and behavioral as well as demographic and life-style questions. In the second administration, nearly 15,000 parents were interviewed, a subset of whom had children in cohort II.

---

10/ For a full review of this history, see Stanford Research Institute, Appendix C: Follow Through Pupil Tests, Parent Interviews, and Teacher Questionnaires, Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, August, 1972, pp. C-88 to C-90.

From the beginning, four objectives were established for designing the interview guide:

1) to provide background information in order to assess the comparability of Follow Through and Non-Follow Through families,

2) to provide information for classifying parents in order to explore possible interactions between treatment and parent characteristics

3) to provide information for creating indicators of parental characteristics which might influence or mediate the treatment effects, and

4) to ascertain the degree of parent's knowledge of, participation in and satisfaction with school programs and Follow Through in particular.

From the standpoint of our purposes here, only objective four bears relevance to parent effects and then only in an oblique manner.

This focus on parents as agents rather than parents as recipients of effects evident in the objectives is also evident in the instrument design.

Of the 79 items in the 1973 parent interview guide not one of them directly asked the parent to reflect upon effects felt as personal benefits or disbenefits. Two items were directed toward things liked or disliked about Follow Through as a total program. One item asks a parent to assess the helpfulness of the program to the child and two items ask about the availability of hot lunches, medical care and dental care--issues which might be seen as benefits to the family. There are a series of items for eliciting the parent's knowledge of and degree of participation in classroom-related activities and the PAC's and one specific item which asks if the parent works in the classroom and is paid for it. While such items as these have some value, particularly when compared over time, in suggesting the degree of benefit parents may have felt from the Follow Through program,

they provide no insight into the reasons for such feelings. Even where specific benefits are suggested such as medical care, dental care, or classroom employment, no item follows up asking if parents recognize such services as benefits or if such services affect their sense of overall satisfaction.

B. The 1973 SRI Analysis

The last full report of the Stanford Research Institute analysis was presented in February of 1973 and covered the data gathering from 1969 to 1971.[11/] Data from the NORC parent surveys and from the teacher and teacher aide surveys conducted by SRI were processed (through factor analysis) into general variables which could be used for Follow Through/Non Follow Through comparisons broken down by cohort, by sponsor, and by project site.

The SRI analysis did not construct these variables to consider parent or teacher effects themselves. No attempt was made to develop longitudinal analyses or to consider the changes in the effects of sponsor programs over time. Nevertheless, the data are analyzed by site, sponsor, and cohort, and it is worth considering the analysis as evidence of the potentials of the survey approach in studying parent and teacher effects.

Parent Data Analysis

The parent interview data collected by NORC in the parent surveys was processed by SRI into seven factor variables. Responses to each survey item were tabulated and distributed over pre-selected judgmental groupings and scaled across standardized distributions separately by variable, cohort, and site. The scores for four parent impact

---

11/ See 1973 SRI Report.

variables are presented by cohort and site in the 1973 SRI Report. These include: parent-child interactions, or the extent to which parents report they actively interact with the child in several different activities; parent-school involvement, or the extent to which parents report they are actively participating in various school related activities; child academic expectations, or the extent to which parents report satisfaction with the child's progress; and, sense of control, or the extent to which parents report a sense of concern and influence over school procedures. Three other variables were developed but not included in this reporting because of excessive missing data or inadequate response variability. These included parent-social interactions, or the extent to which parents actively interact with others in the community; parent locus of control, or the extent to which parents report a sense of control over life chances; and, parent-PAC participation, or the extent to which parents report awareness of or actively participate in the PAC's.

The scores for the first four parent outcome variables are presented by cohort for each of the sites included in the 1973 SRI report. Sponsor level measures are then presented by averaging and adjusting these scores for the various sites in each sponsor sample. No attempt was made to analyze this data on a national level and no overall Follow Through/Non-Follow Through comparisons are presented.

Teacher Data Analysis

Unlike the parent interview survey, SRI did not contract out the administration of the teacher survey. Instead, SRI designed and administered its own self-report questionnaires. Separate questionnaires were designed for teachers and teacher aides. Initially, these questionnaires were designed around two objectives:

a) to provide profiles of the teachers in terms of demographic characteristics, the training and support they received, and the goals and attitudes they held, and

b) to provide information about the different effects of different Follow Through sponsors' programs. 12/

The questionnaires were first administered in the spring of 1970. The returns on this initial administration resulted in some revisions in the instrument; the survey was again conducted in the spring of 1971. The questionnaires were sent to all Follow Through coordinators who distributed them to both the Follow Through and Non-Follow Through teachers whose classes had been tested in fall, 1970. Each Follow Through teacher received one aide questionnaire which was to be completed by the regular teacher aide. (Where there was more than one, a randomizing technique was used to select one.) Of the teacher questionnaires sent out in spring, 1971, 1462 were completed and returned for a response rate of 82%. Of the aide questionnaires, 804 or 80% were completed and returned.

For the analysis the spring 1971 data was coded and verified. The basis of this coding lay in outcome measures derived from the 1970 returns. Two outcome measures for teachers had been constructed:

a. Parent-educator image, or the extent to which teachers reported that they felt it necessary to "get together with parents outside of the classroom" (essentially a teacher attitude towards parents index), and

b. Professional acceptance of method, or the extent to which teachers report they would not prefer to adopt a method other than the one they are currently using (presumably, the sponsor's model).

Using the 1971 data, then, each of the evaluated projects were scored on these two outcome measures for Follow Through and Non-Follow Through teachers by cohort. Then, these various scores were averaged and adjusted

---

12/ 1973 SRI Report, pp. 41-42.

by sponsor to provide sponsor level scores on the two outcome measures. Again no attempt was made to analyze this data on a national level, and no overall Follow Through/Non-Follow Through comparisons are presented.

C. The 1974 Abt Analysis

Since the evaluation re-organization of 1971, SRI continued to be responsible for data collection and processing, and NORC continued to administer the parent survey, but the analysis has been conducted by Abt Associates. Abt produced its first final report in 1974.[13/] Besides employing parent and teacher data as intervening variables in the analysis of child effects, the 1974 Abt Report presents separate appendices of parent and teacher analyses.

Parent Studies

Recognizing the double objectives of Follow Through with regard to parents, Abt begins its analysis of the parent data noting

> An exploration of parent information may provide both a background for understanding what is happening in the classroom and a perspective on the extent to which Follow Through is achieving its goals of increased parent involvement. [14/]

Three sets of analyses were run on the parent data. The first considered

---

13/ 1974 Abt Report. In May of 1975 a second Final Report was issued by Abt. Here we will consider only the first.

14/ 1974 Abt Report, Vol. II, p. I-1.

the parental demographic characteristics, attitudes and behaviors in order to provide background information for the child effects study. As this study has less relevance to effects it is not reviewed here. The second analysis examines indicators of parental behavior and attitudes measured during the spring of a child's third grade year to determine if Follow Through effects parent attitude or behavior by comparing Follow Through and non-Follow Through responses both overall and within sponsors. The third analysis examines the relationships between parent attitudes and reported behavior and other parent variables including family income, parent's perception of school's attitudes toward parent involvement and reported parent-child interactions. To determine program effects this study also uses Follow Through/Non-Follow Through comparisons. Each of the three studies was carried out using only data from the Spring, 1972 parent survey. The second and third study used only data from the parents of cohort I and third grade children. Four single demographic items were used to represent demographic background. The other six variables, parent-school interaction (two clusters), parent-child's school oriented behavior, parent satisfaction with child's academic success, parent's knowledge of Follow Through and parent's perception of school receptivity were all developed from clusters of items by cluster analysis. First simple regressions and then multiple regressions including covariates were run to examine relationships.

The results were generally not surprising and seldom very marked or distinctive. Overall Follow Through parents report lower incomes and

somewhat lower educational attainment for mothers than do Non-Follow Through parents. Both Follow Through and Non-Follow Through parents report about the same proportion of mothers working in the classroom although Follow Through parents do report slightly more parent-school interaction. Overall both sets of parents report equal satisfaction with children's academic success although Follow Through parents report slightly more satisfaction with children's affective growth. There appeared to be a great deal of variability in the specific analyses by sponsor although one interesting result appeared. For four out of the seven main sponsors Non-Follow Through parents reported more knowledge about the Follow Through program than did Follow Through parents.

Teacher Studies

The Abt analysis set out to analyze the teacher questionnaire data in terms of two types of information--basic background and demographic data and specific program data, such as teacher training, teacher attitudes toward sponsor's philosophy, and teacher classroom behavior. The analysis used only data from the spring, 1972, administration and attempted no longitudinal analysis or analysis of changes over time. Thus, the analysis is primarily descriptive. In order to handle the data, the responses from the questionnaires were organized into four categories (attitudes toward Follow Through and sponsors, focus of teacher training, teaching goals and practices, and parent and community involvement) upon which cluster analysis was performed to develop nine cluster variables. Five areas of interest were then addressed.

A simple cross tabular analysis was performed to explore variations in personal and professional background characteristics. In general, Follow Through teachers were found to be younger, less experienced, and somewhat newer to their current school assignment than Non-Follow Through teachers. These contrasts proved fairly consistent across sponsors and grade levels. Little difference appeared between Follow Through and Non-Follow Through teachers in terms of educational attainment although Non-Follow Through teachers tended to earn slightly higher salaries. Slightly more Follow Through teachers than Non-Follow Through come from minority backgrounds and live in the same or similar neighborhoods to their pupils although this varied some by sponsor and size of community.

A multiple regression was used to explore variations in teacher training. There was much variation by sponsor and by size of community. Some Follow Through teachers received far more training than Non-Follow Through teachers, and others received less.

A multiple regression was used to analyze variations in teacher values, attitudes, and reported behaviors. In terms of a list of competing values, there was little difference between the values Follow Through and Non-Follow Through teachers selected. In terms of particular skills teachers placed value on, there was significant variation among sponsors, but, in general, Follow Through teachers placed higher value on parent involvement and more often visited children's homes than did Non-Follow Through teachers.

Variations in the degree of satisfaction with and faithfulness to the sponsor's model were also explored by a multiple regression analysis. Marked variations are observed in satisfaction and faithfulness by sponsor, grade level, and size of community. Kindergarten Follow Through teachers who do not teach in large cities and who use one of three specific sponsor models appear to be most satisfied and most faithful.

A final analysis using correlations and partial correlations was directed at exploring relations between teachers' personal and professional characteristics and their reports of training, values, attitudes, and behavior. Generally, correlations proved small. Ethnicity showed some correlation with amount of training and some values and expectations. Length of total teaching experience also showed some correlation with amount of training. The study concludes, "What is perhaps most striking about . . . [the analysis] . . . is the relatively small size of the relationships observed between teachers' personal and professional characteristics and their values, attitudes, and reported behavior." 15/

15/ 1974 Abt Report, Vol. II, pp. II-72.

D. The 1976 SRI Cross-Tabular Analysis

In order to assess the values and strengths of the teacher question and consider means for improving the instrument, SRI ran a cross-tabular analysis of item responses on the spring, 1975, data.[16/] The analysis compared responses between Follow Through and Non-Follow Through teachers as well as among teachers in various sponsor programs. The report is rather short on summaries and conclusions, but some general perspective develops in the reading. Follow Through and Non-Follow Through teachers generally do not differ greatly in their responses, and the differences that are observed are mostly small. Specifically, there is almost no difference between Follow Through and Non-Follow Through teachers on their ranking of educational goals, on the adequacy of educational materials and resources, on classroom descriptions, and on training emphasis. Some, but not large, differences are observed on the availability of health and counseling services, on the adequacy of financial resources, on visiting children's homes, on availability of parent volunteers, on attitude toward parent involvement, on satisfaction with overall growth of students, on job satisfaction, and on what actors have more impact on classroom activities. Generally, Follow Through teachers value parent involvement slightly more, feel slightly more satisfied with their job and their students' development, and report more adequate services and parent participation.

In reflecting on the analysis, the authors occasionally note their skepticism of the findings (some projects report 80% of their parents volunteering

---

16/ See Connie Sutherland, Teresa Middleton, and Anne Wright, Spring 1975 Teaching Staff Questionnaire Cross-Tabular Findings, Menlo Park: Stanford Research Institute, May, 1976.

and 50 parents per teacher coming in to talk), but otherwise little critique of the analysis. Mostly they recommend response areas which have been neglected in the instrument design. These include questions concerning changes over time, relation between sponsors' prescription and teachers' behavior, meanings and values of responses to respondents, and the objective basis underlying various attitudinal responses.

E. Summary

The national evaluation has sponsored two different methods of data collection in conducting its national survey of Follow Through parents and teachers. The self report questionnaire was used in collecting teacher and teacher aide data, while the survey interview was used in collecting parent data. In both cases instruments were designed to produce both highly structured responses as well as more open ended discussions.

The more structured administrative access to teachers and teacher aides and the assumption that such persons could reasonably self administer the instrument surely contributed to the decision to design a questionnaire for gathering teacher data. In order to guarantee a reasonable parent sample it may have seemed necessary to go the more expensive interviewer route although this technique does leave the data vulnerable to various interviewer biasing problems. None of the evaluation reports reviewed offered a comparison of the two data gathering techniques.

As noted above none of the various national evaluation analyses focused centrally on determining program effects on parents or teachers. The data were typically used in expanding the analysis of child effects. Yet in

several of the more detailed analyses findings are produced that bear heavily upon the issues of parent and teacher effects. Furthermore, even where th se studies do not centrally focus on parent and teacher effects, the data gathering and data analysis procedures offer significant insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the survey approach in conducting future studies. These observations will await further consideration in the comparative review section which follows the presentation of the other research approaches. Here is may be useful to summarize the findings from the various analyses of parent and teacher data which do bear upon program effects.

Findings

Longitudinal analysis of parent or teacher responses over time differentiated by individual were not conducted. Thus program effects must be deduced from analyses of treatment and control groups assuming that the groups were roughly equivalent before the program and that differences between the groups indicate the effects of the program. The most interesting observation on the parent analyses is how little difference actually is found between Follow Through and Non-Follow Through parents, given the frequently cited anecdotes of parent effects. Some between-group differences are noted in the aggregated analysis, but the differences offer little evidence of dramatic effects on parents. From this we might hypothesize that these dramatic accounts of parent effects must originate from a relatively small sample of parents. Alternatively we might hypothesize that the interview procedures failed to adequately capture data on these effects or something about the survey analysis served to wash out the intensity of these effects. Given the findings from the other approaches it appears that this latter is the case, but this will be developed later.

Much of what has been said of the parent analysis applies to the teacher analysis except that there are fewer dramatic anecdotes about teachers to compare with these findings. It appears that the teacher training, particularly under some sponsors, has shown possible effects in terms of values and attitudes. Further it appears that the Follow Through program itself has had significant effects on classroom format in terms of extra resources, extra services and extra adults in the classroom. But these are not so much program effects on teachers which might demonstrate persistence over the years as they are program effects on program implementation.

## 2.2 Sponsor and Site Evaluations

Each year Follow Through sponsors and Follow Through sites are required to report on their progress and evaluate their programs. This requirement results in an annual flood of reports filed with the Office of Education. Few guidelines have been established for these assessments and their quality and focus varies greatly.[17] Yet some of the reports do consider parents and teachers and these are worth a review here.

Under a 1974 contract, the Huron Institute reviewed the bulk of the 1973-74 sponsor and site evaluation reports.[18] While this review gave only secondary priority to issues of parents and teachers, it provides the best overview of this material. In total 17 sponsor reports and 85 site reports were examined. Throughout these 102 reports there was little discussion of teachers and no noted discussion of program effects on teachers. Generally teachers were considered only as the agents of the program and not as benefactors. Some little discussion did occur in terms of classroom observation, particularly in the University of Pittsburgh sponsor report, most all of the Pittsburgh site reports and several of the Far West site reports.

---

17/ Interview with Greg Jackson, February 26, 1976.

18/ This review is covered in three papers by Gregory Jackson entitled Review of Follow Through Sponsor and Local Data, Huron Institute, Cambridge, MA. In particular see the Interim Report, July 30, 1974. See also a review by Mary Kennedy, Preliminary Review of Sponsor and LEA Evaluation Data in Follow Through, unpublished, Office of Education, Budgeting and Evaluation, Washington, D.C., November 30, 1975.

The sponsor and site reports offer more information on parents. General discussion is occasionally included upon the Policy Advisory Committee activities, particularly in the Educational Development Center sponsor and site reports and the University of Kansas and the Far West site reports. Information concerning the type and degree of parent involvement is frequently included either generally, in tabular form, or as results of questionnaires. This information is particularly significant in the Far West site reports, the Bank Street site reports, the University of Florida site and sponsor reports, the Hampton Institute site and sponsor reports and the University of North Dakota site reports. For instance, the 1974 University of Florida annual report reports on a survey of parent attitudes as developed from a random sample of 90 parents for two of its sites. A simple questionnaire covering 33 items was administered covering ten predetermined categories, including parent involvement with child, school achievement, interaction of parent and school, parent participation in Follow Through parent meetings, etc. Generally, the findings show a favorable response to the programs with particular pleasure directed at the increased time spent between parents and children and the increased communication between parents and teachers. The questionnaire was limited primarily to attitudinal issues and asked little about actual behavior or frequencies and other quantifiable characteristics.

The University of North Dakota began parent and teacher surveys in their 1971 report.[19/] They ran interviews of randomly selected parents

---

19/ Follow Through, Final Report, New School, University of North Dakota, August, 1971.

of cohort II children and the second grade of cohort III. They tested attitude toward program, frequency of participation in meetings, degree of participation of paid personnel, etc. The study did not include questions directly related to parents as direct recipients of program effects. By 1972 the University of North Dakota was running a much more sophisticated survey, which included questionnaires for parents, teachers, teacher aides and children. The Final Report for 1973 includes examples of four questionnaires that are reasonably developed and quite lengthy. The results are broken down by site. The parent results are distributed by categories: degree of contact with classroom teachers, description of classrooms, attitudes toward classroom, changes observed in child, child's attitude toward school, teacher-child relations, information/attitude about Follow Through and attitude toward child's reporting system. The child survey results are broken down into classroom activities and child's involvement, teacher-child relationships, peer-child relationships and general classroom attitude. Teacher survey results are classified into attitude about open classroom, opinion about various educational topics, extent of parent visitation and description of classroom. Generally, parents were sampled on a random basis by site, but teachers and children were interviewed as availability permitted. By 1974 these surveys were narrowed down and focused at three sites. These included 143 parents, third grade children at 25 separate schools accounting for 260 children and 21 teachers ranging across grades at three sites. While the methodology and implementation of the surveys appear to have improved over

the years, the objectives for each remained roughly the same. Never were the questions focused direclty upon the effects of the program upon parents or teachers as intended recipients of program services.

Bank Street began its own parent survey in 1972. Parent volunteers were recruited and trained to administer interviews to a randonly selected sample of 25 per cent of the parents of each site. In the spring of 1973 a second round of parent interviews was conducted in ten of the Bank Street sites. In this survey 445 parents or 50 per cent of the third grade parents of each site (not randomly selected) were interviewed. There were five objectives of this survey:

a) character of child's feelings about school
b) character of parent-school contact
c) depth of parent understanding about program
d) parent attitudes about program, and,
e) character of impact of program upon parents and family life.

Only in this last objective did any of the sponsor level evaluations reviewed directly address parents as direct recipients of program effects. In this section the Bank Street survey does report a high frequency of PAC attendance and parent participation at social events, parent meetings, etc. Of some interest in the report that 28 per cent of those interviewed had received a degree of diploma during the time of the Follow Through invovlement and that 27 per cent of the parents interviewed had at one point worked as staff members in the Follow Through program. But all of this may be biased by the non-random character of the sample which may have resulted in the interviewing of primarily the more active program parents.

Typically, the site level evaluation reports were more limited and less developed than the sponsor level reports. Occasionally the review of the files would produce a site report which would directly confront parent effects. For instance, the 1972-73 Goldsboro, North Carolina annual report (Far West sponsor) provides a specific chapter devoted to the PAC and parent involvement. The freqency of PAC meetings is noted and its activities are listed. Then under the heading of each school is provided a short text noting the per cent of parents of whom participated in school conferences and a listing of each school acitivity with a number signifying the mumber of parents who attended. On each of the various social services the number of recorded users is also listed.

The 1972 Hillsborough County annual report (Florida sponsor) provides another typical example. Under a section on parent involvement the frequency of PAC meetings and the attendance at each is recorded. The events taking place at the parents' center are listed with their frequency during the year. Then each of the various meetings of parents are listed by date and location and the number in attendance is given. In an appendix the report goes on to include the results of their own five-item parent survey of attitudes toward the Follow Through program.

Such site level reports reflect the sponsor level reports in focus though the sophistication of their reporting is often less adequate.

Generally, in terms of parent effects, the information contained in the sponsor and site evaluation reports is of limited value. In most cases, where parents are centrally considered, particularly in the cases of the University of Florida and University of North Dakota sponsor and site reports, the attention on parents views them primarily as agents, not benefactors. In those cases, such as the questionnaires or anecdotes where it is possible to draw out implications of parent effects, this information is limited by its lack of generalizability and failure to signify range and frequency. The effects of Follow Through on teachers is even less well considered in the various sponsor and site level reports.

Like the national evaluation reports, the sponsor and site level reports leave much to be desired in providing an adequate perspective on parent and teacher effects. Some sponsors and a few sites have obviously made attempts to consider particularly parents as participants in their programs. Yet these attempts have often been exploratory and shallow in findings and methods. Questionnaires are often not checked for validity or reliability. Sampling is unsystematic and interviewing controls are all but lacking. Control groups have not been used and little interpretation follows the reporting of results. Finally, objectives are seldom spelled out so that it is frequently not clear why parent attitude or participation figures are collected at all. The wide variation in content and quality of these evaluations makes them inadequate as an aggregate means of eliciting insight into parent and teacher effects. Yet the occasional commendable effort suggests that this approach is worthy of further consideration where field reports are relevant.

## 3.0 THE CLASSROOM OBSERVATION APPROACH

Many of the Follow Through sponsors have focused the majority of their attention on teacher training. In order to implement their models these sponsors have focused upon affecting the practice of teachers along model-specified lines. Realizing that teacher behavior was critical in realizing the sponsor's model in the classroom the national evaluation sought means of observing the degree to which sponsor models were implemented in the classroom. Beginning in 1968 SRI developed an observational system for observing and recording teacher-child behavior in the classroom.[20/] This observation instrument was tested and redesigned and given its first formal administration in Spring, 1970 at one site for each of eight sponsors. Observations were again recorded in Sping, 1971 and, after an instrument revision, again in Spring, 1972. Again the instrument was revised and a major administration was carried out in Spring, 1973 at 37 sites representing seven different sponsors. For comparison purposes a selection of Non-Follow Through classrooms was also observed, but rather than matching these control classes one to one their data was pooled to provide a standard pooled Non-Follow Through comparison.

---

20/ This study is presented in Jane Stallings, et al, Follow Through Classroom Observation Evaluation 1972-1973, Menlo Park: Stanford Research Institute, August, 1974.

The Follow Through Classroom Observation Instrument that SRI developed was designed to provide a systematic way for observation data to be reliably recorded. Through the use of an optical code system, it yields a record of classroom activities, the classroom environment, the interactions between teachers and/or teacher aides and children and interactions among children. The instrument includes three schedules: a classroom summary sheet, a physical environment sheet and a classroom observation sheet. This last covers three parts: a classroom check list, a five-minute observation preamble and a five minute observation. During a single day of observation the classroom summary sheet and the physical environment sheet are completed once and the classroom observation sheet is designed to record the specific style, content and character of the interactions engaged in by the focus person over a five-minute period. 21/

Findings.

Sponsor implementation variables were developed by SRI from their data in conjunction with sponsor staff members. Using these variables the data from the site observations were analyzed into overall implementation scores in order to compare sponsor by sponsor implementation.

---

21/ A second classroom observation study of Follow Through which differs from the SRI approach was developed at the University of Florida. See Robert S. Soar, Final Report: Follow Through Classroom Process Measurement and Pupil Growth (1970-1971), Gainesville: University of Florida, Institute for Development of Human Resources, June, 1973. For a review of both this study and a more complete review of the SRI study see the review of Follow Through Previous Reports by Walt Haney and John Villaume, Huron Institute, forthcoming, August, 1976.

In summarizing their findings SRI concluded that the degree of implementation of the sponsors' models at the various sites varied greatly by site. While all sponsor classroom mean scores were found to be above the pooled Non-Follow Through mean, all sponsors except Far West, Kansas and High/Scope had some classroom scores which fell below the Non-Follow Through mean. The least amount of variation among sites within a sponsor was found for Far West and the greatest variation was found for Bank Street.[22/]

No specific effort was made in the classroom observation study to determine the general effects of Follow Through on teachers, but an attempt was made to analyze specific items from the national evaluation teacher questionnaires with the implementation scores to determine which elements of teacher training and which teacher characteristics related to effective implementation. Unfortunately the correlations from these analyses were very low and the findings were not presented.[23/]

Although classroom observations were carried out for several years, no attempt was made to compare findings over different points in time. As with the survey analysis inferences of teacher effects under the classroom observation approach must be made without reference to effects within the comparison group (which in this case is not differentiated by site or sponsor).

---

22/ Stallings, 1974, p. 195.

23/ Generally the data from the teacher questionnaires was found to be inadequate to provide a reasonable understanding of teacher training experiences. See Stallings, 1974, p. 191.

There are no specific conclusions to this SRI study which assess it as a method. In fact, its continued development was cut short after 1974 due in large part to its high costs. Yet the classroom observation techniques were designed to study teacher in their daily practice. It would not be unreasonable to construct a study of teacher practice on a pre- and post-training basis or to compare Follow Through and Non-Follow Through teachers on a matched sample basis in order to assess program effects. For this reason this approach is included here even though its actual use throws little light on teacher effects.

## 4.0 THE UNOBTRUSIVE MEASURES APPROACH

Beginning in 1972 the Huron Institute under encouragement from the Office of Education took a more direct interest in effects of Follow Through on parents. This interest in parent effects intersected with a second interest--a methodological interest in the value of unobtrusive measures as indicators of effects. The notion underlying unobtrusive measures asserts that program environments are rich in a large amount of data, some of which is the direct result of the administration and self-monitoring of the program. These data, because they are accessible without direct intrusion into the treatment, can be gathered unobtrusively as indicators of various program performance characteristics.[24/] The alledged advantages of this approach are its non-intervention, its avoidance of interviewer or questionnaire bias and its relatively low costs as compared with survey or participants observation approaches.

During the summer of 1972 the Huron staff reviewed the feasibility of an unobtrusive measures study of parent effects. In this preliminary assessment a significant number of such unobtrusive indicators were identified to warrant a study of the benefits of assessing parent effects with this approach. During the fall, Jeannette Hargroves of the Huron staff and several assistants conducted a field exploration of unobtrusive measures as indicators of parent effects.

---

24/ The standard reference for this approach is E. J. Webb, D. T. Campbell, R. D. Swartz and L. Sechrest, Unobtrusive Measures (Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1966).

Three hypotheses were developed covering potential effects on parents with regard to increased educational attainment, increased economic status and improved attitudes towards self. Four sites were visited in order to attempt to gather data relevant to the hypotheses. Both unobtrusive measures and interviews were used to gather the data. Various program records were relied upon as the unobtrusive measures and interviews were used to assess the indicators. The findings are reported in conjunction with each hypothesis.[25/]

Hypothesis I: "Follow Through parents gain new access to educational courses at the high school and college level." In all four sites, Follow Through had not created high school equivalency courses because they already existed in the community. Three of the four sites visited showed less than 50 per cent of their paraprofessionals and less than one per cent of their other parents enrolled in courses for credit. Hargroves suggests that this hypothesis may have been oriented at the wrong level. The opportunity for educational enrollments appears to vary greatly by site and the indicators may more reflect this inconsistent opportunity pattern than the motivation toward educational advancement.

Hypothesis II: "Many Follow Through parents now employed by Follow Through have formerly been welfare recipients." The study found that in

---

25/ See Memorandum from Jeannette Hargroves to Garry McDaniels, Huron Institute, February 12, 1973.

the two sites where this was explored, records on past employment histories of paraprofessionals are not easily accessible and often do not record welfare and ADC information. Furthermore, of the 17 out of 22 cases where prior employment information was provided all had work experience prior to Follow Through employment.

Hypothesis III: "Parents' additudes about their own work capabilities and personal goals are more positive through participation in program leadership and decision making." Again records were inadequate and even efforts to demonstrate job upgrading over the program years was difficult as paraprofessionals infrequently changed their positions. Hargroves pointed out the problem here may have originated in the loose manner in which the hypothesis was written.

In her conclusions Hargroves finds these results less than satisfactory and admits to a pessimistic attitude concerning the method. Hargroves makes efforts to clearly separate her pessimism concerning the method of investigation from the value of investigating parent effects. Generally she finds that the records are simply not adequate for unobtrusive measures, that without much more insight into the structure and opportunities of the various programs generalized hypotheses are either shallow or irrelevant and that even where data relevant to generalized hypotheses do exist they in no way capture the rich character and individual meanings of the effects Follow Through has had on parents. While she affirms the value of studying parents, Hargroves concludes by recommending more study before realistic hypotheses can be formulated and effective measures can be found.

## 5.0 THE FIELD STUDY APPROACH

The "softest" and most qualitative approach to studying parents and teachers would be the field study. The field study can provide great depth and richness to insight and over the years of the evaluation it, too, has been looked to as a means of studying the effects of Follow Through.[26] During the early years of the evaluation SRI sponsored a set of field case studies in order to specify more tightly the character of the Follow Through program as it was implemented at the site level and to record the systems change aspects of the program's implementation within the existing community institutional structures. Such community studies were abandoned after the evaluation reorganization in 1971.

Beginning in the fall of 1975, the Huron Institute developed its own field studyies in order to investigate directly the experiences of parents and teachers with the Follow Through program. This effort follows the earlier explorations of parent effects conducted preliminary to the Huron unobtrusive measures study.

### 5.1 The SRI Community Studies

During the 1968-67 and 1969-70 school years the SRI staff conducted intensive case studies of the social processes involved in institutional

---

26/ Good references to such field studies can be found in Matilda White Riley, Sociological Research (New York: Harcourt, Brace, World, 1963), Barney Glazer and Anselm Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory (Chicago: Aldine, 1967), and Glenn Jacobs, ed., The Participant Observer: Encounters with Social Reality (New York: Braziller, 1970).

change in a small number of Follow Through sites.[27] During the first year three sites were studied in order to identify the major variables of institutional change which could be worked into an integrated model to guide further studies. The findings from this first year study revealed the traditional bureaucratic power structure view of the school systems. The second year study involved two phases: first, a series of interviews to establish "a baseline of traditional arrangements" and second, a series of interviews to record changes. For this second year five sites were studied. The resulting analysis of these studies developed "a paradigm of institutional change" that suggested that the level of parental involvement played a critical role in determining the form and degree of institutional change. With this model in mind hypotheses were developed for testing during a third set of community studies carried out over the 1970-71 school year. Nine project sites were involved in this third year of study.

The nine sites were selected from clusters arranged on the basis of a) degree of sponsor's parent emphasis, b) degree of reported active parent participants and c) urban-rural location of community. In selecting a range of parents to interview, candidates were identified according to the level of their participation as revealed by the previous year's NORC parent interview responses. In selecting teachers for interview, only those teachers who were currently teaching children of parents who were interviewed were

---

[27] See Stanford Research Institute, Appendix E: Follow Through Community Studies, Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Insitute, August, 1972.

selected as candidates. The interviews were semi-structured and left open ended to encourage "naive" perceptions and subjective descriptions of "expectations, attitudes, norms and patterns of behavior". Altogether eight interviewers conducted 129 interviews (44 teachers, 75 parents and 10 PAC chairmen) during a three-week period in May, 1971.

Findings.

The results of the interviews were compiled according to the variables identified in the model and computations for one scalogram and several factor analyses were performed to explore the model. The conclusions of the study find that the extent of parent participation in the program is fairly stable from one year to another. The greater the information which parents possess about the Follow Through program in general and its implementation in their community in specific, the higher the level of their involvement in it. Expectations for parent participation--both those held by the teacher and those held by parents for themselves--had a significant effect on parent participation. However there appeared to be a lack of consensus between parents and teachers as to what constitutes the appropriate program relevant behavior for parents in and out of the classroom.

The study concludes by advising that in order to increase the level of parent involvement in Follow Through the role expectations of both parents and teachers towards parent participation must be raised and the expectations need to be brought into congruency.

## 5.2 The Huron Field Study

In order to learn more about the effects parents and teachers felt and reported that the Follow Through program has had in their lives, Huron generated its own field study.

The time and resources were not available to carry out extensive case studies of several sites. Nor did the feasibility nature of the study actually require the research rigor necessary to provide conclusive answers. We wanted to design an interviewing plan which covered a lot of territory broadly and efficiently enough to suggest general answers rather than definitive findings. For the sake of efficiency it seemed best to look for effects where the territory appeared most fertile. The sponsor agencies were roughly grouped according to how much focus they appeared that they placed on parents or teachers as participants. Assuming that the widest range of effects would appear where sponsors most self-consciously focused upon parents or teachers as participants, sponsors were selected as representing those most self-consciously directed at parents or teachers. Thus the University of Florida's parent education program was considered a good candidate for exploring parent effects and the Bank Street College child-centered program was selected as a good candidate for exploring both teacher and parent effects. For each sponsor a site was selected which appeared from the national evaluation reports and from comments of various informants to have well implemented programs. With two sites in mind arrangements were made for field visits. Before visiting these sites some initial test interviews were begun in one site convenient to the offices of the Huron Institute.

The actual interview method remained much the same throughout the various sites. In general, parents were interviewed in their homes in open, somewhat structured, tape-recorded sessions lasting an hour to an hour and a half. Most all of the parent interviews occurred in one-to-one style although in three cases more than two parents (one a husband and wife) were interviewed together. Typically the parents were recommended and access was provided by the local project director. Selection was based on three requested categories: vary active parents, not so active parents and program-employed parents.

Teachers were also interviewed in an open, informal, tape-recorded one-to-one style. The interviews took place at the school, although the exact location was determined by an often difficult search for a space which would guarantee privacy. Again the teachers were selected by the local project director, but without any particular categories suggested. In each case the project director was also interviewed first to provide background and a sense of the questions which might be most interesting to explore among the parents and teachers.

In total 35 interviews were conducted with parents and teachers by one interviewer. Six interviews were conducted with parents in the exploratory site. A rough interview guide was developed from this experience although it was modified at each of the two other sites. Four teachers and ten parents were interviewed at the first site and four teachers and eleven parents were interviewed at the second site.

Findings.

No analytical model was developed prior to the interviews (although a selection of interrelated questions was prepared) and no formalized analysis was performed after the interviews. Instead a general overview of parent and teacher effects was developed for each site. These are presented in some detail in the appendix. Here it is sufficient to summarize these findings.

Parents interviewed in the first site, Hometown,[28/] were varied in their response to the program. Some felt very positively; one held negative feelings. All agreed that the program had affected their lives significantly. Yet they were rather vague about specifics. (In retrospect, this may have been partially due to my rather cautious approach to these first interviews.) Most felt that the program had helped them because it helped their children, yet mention was made of the effects of free dental care on the family's budget, supplements to the family's income from hourly Follow Through employment, chances to meet other parents, parent classes and recreational activities and tuition supplements for local college and community based courses. No teachers were interviewed at Hometown.

Parents interviewed at Northville also showed marked enthusiasm for the program noting in particular how much more and faster their children were learning. Many of the parents had participated in what appeared to

---

28/ Pseudonyms have been used in order to avoid unnecessary attention on particular site characteristics.

be a very active and politically effective PAC. Several parents revealed remarkable stories of life changes which they credited to experiences under the Follow Through program. These experiences resulted from involvement in the PAC, involvement as a teaching aide or participation in PAC-sponsored parent activities. Because Northville is a small city with limited institutional channels, the PAC and parent activities programs appeared to offer a very important community participation system for low income women in the community, many of whom were isolated and unserved by social services prior to being recruited into the program. Many of these women also noted highly valued use of Follow Through health and social services.

The teachers interviewed in Northville were remarkable for their enthusiasm and sense of dedicated purpose. They all felt positive about Follow Through for letting them do what they claimed they really wanted to do anyway. They felt positive about the sponsor training, but did not see it as causing a major departure from their desired style of teaching. Most saw the Follow Through program as a helpful, but temporary experience in a career development pattern which had been set before entering the program. All of the teachers noted the great advantage they felt at having a "second adult" in the classroom and having some additional material and budget resources.

Parents at Southville also reported great enthusiasm for the program and some amazing stories of how the program had affected their personal lives. Several parents noted their deep gratitude to the program and its central part in their life setting. They noted how daily they

participated in classroom activities, how they "loved" the program and its staff or how they hoped it would be around for their grandchildren. In particular, parents responded to the parent activities, the classroom participation and the weekly home visits of parent educators. The close daily relations between home and school were seen as drawing the family together more and helping both parents and children to learn subjects and methods of interpersonal relations. Parents also noted the help provided by the supportive health and social services.

Teachers at Southville generally responded to Follow Through in a positive manner. They noted the great help provided by the parent educators, the curriculum specialists, the sponsor's training and the parent's classroom presence, in that order. They also saw the program as of great benefit to the children and parents, but did not see the program as radically altering their teaching style or professional identity.

Parent Effects.

The results of the interviews at these three sites clearly suggest that Follow Through has had a significant effect upon the lives of some parents. These effects are most clearly evident among a population of parents who are a) women-mothers of Follow Through children, b) of lower income and c) who have had significant involvement with Follow Through activities--particularly the PAC or the teaching aide positions. While it is probable that every site contains some such parents, the number of parents, the kinds of effects and the degree to which the effects can clearly be said to result directly from Follow Through appears to vary significantly by site. The site characteristics which appear most significant in determining such variation in parent effects include: a) the attitude of the project director toward parent participation, b) the degree to which the sponsor model and personnel focus upon parents as agents or recipients of program services, c) the general attitude of the Follow Through teachers and the school administration towards parent participation, d) the existence of a reasonably comfortable and non-threatening physical facility for parent activities and e) the local community ambiance in terms of popular awareness and participation in civic and political processes.

The kinds of effects Follow Through has had on parents range widely. In sites where effects are significantly distributed such effects may include:

a) The character of parents' participation in school-related activities. Follow Through may result in parent participation in classroom picnics and trips, in parent support groups, in program policy meetings (PAC's, PTA's, etc.) and in adult social recreational activities.

b) The character of parent-teacher relations. Some parents report more frequent contact with teachers, more ease in approaching teachers, more comfort with teachers as friends and advisors and more satisfaction with the performance and objectives of teachers.

c) The character of the relations between parents and school administration and policies. Some parents report more frequent contact with school administrators, more frequent attendance and participation at school board and other policy-making meetings, more ease in approaching school administrators with questions, problems or demands, better understanding of school policy and how it is made and more of a sense of personal efficacy in bringing about changes in school policy or personnel. Some parents also note an increase in frustration and cynicism in trying to affect changes in school administration.

d) The character of parents' awareness and participation in their children's education. Not only does Follow Through result in more frequent and comfortable participation in classroom activities for some parents but also a more differentiated and insightful understanding of child behavior, child learning and child development problems in school and at home. This includes a greater willingness to see child behavior in terms of learning and to participate with the child in such learning activities as reading, writing, touring and domestic tasks.

e) The character of the families' economic situation. Follow Through does result in some parents acquiring full-time or part-time salaries, supplemental hourly income for discrete or non-reoccurring tasks, job experience for career development or advancement, subsidized health, dental,

psychological or special educational services for children and fulltime kindergartens which permit an early return to dual income potential in the family.

f) The extent of parent educational attainment. Some Follow Through parents have returned to formal education advancement. For some this may mean simply taking courses of interst; for others it has meant getting a G.E.D. or going on to acquire an A.A. or B.A. degree. Where such courses have been relevant to Follow Through the program has offered some parents financial aid or subsidized courses.

g) The character of non-vocational development. Some parents report participation in a wide assortment of cultural enrichment, physical health or social integration activities including cooking, sewing and crafts classes offered by Follow Through parents, sports and exercise activities, family and child raising support groups and travel, lecture or film series. Some parents note significant increases in their skills, interests, and overall awareness of their community and culture.

h) The character of parent self-identity and life attitude. Some parents report remarkable stories of how involvement with the program has resulted in a heightened sense of self worth, an increased sense of status in the community and a greater willingness to take responsibility for their own lives and work for the betterment of themselves, their family and their community.

Clearly not all such types of effects are equally distributed among even those parents who have been active participants and certainly not all would be clearly evident at even the best Follow Through sites. It appears that there is a great deal of variation in parent effects. Although it also appears that program effects on some parents have been extensive.

In terms of estimating the numbers of parents displaying the various effects the field methods of this particular investigation are inadequate. In terms of the total community population the percentages are certainly not large. Most likely the percentages are not very large in terms of the total low income population of a community either. In terms of the actual low income population of parents of early school-age children the numbers may be more significant depending upon what degree of effect is considered a good indicator, although again there would be significant site variation. Finally, in terms of the total population of Follow Through parents, the numbers might even be quite impressive at certain sites providing that the indicators of effect were set reasonably. Some indicators such as increased participation in school-related activities or increased contact between teacher and parent might show extensive effects while others such as earning an advanced educational certificate, although significant as an indicator of depth of effect, may not suggest much effect in terms of breadth or frequency. Further, the wide variation in types of effect may suggest that unless the whole range of types of effect are studied, the actual frequency of effects may appear deceptively low. No one type of effect appears to represent well the existence of other types of effect.

Further, causal relations between parent effects and program implementation also appear quite variable. In some small rural communities where little adult community action opportunities exist, Follow Through is rather clearly responsible for the effects parents impute to it. In other more organized, typically larger and more

urban communities it is not so easy to isolate the Follow Through program as the clear independent variable. Further it is more difficult to argue that without Follow Through the reported effect would never have occurred. That is, in more organized communities the potential to experience the reported effect may have ripened under one of several other programs. Follow Through as a cause of the effect and Follow Through as merely the opportunity to realize the effect appear more distinct. One thing appears more clear. Except in those sponsor plans where parents are considered a primary agent of the educational treatment, the actual content of the sponsor's curriculum and most likely the whole nature of the sponsor's program is not a very significant factor in the distribution of parent effects. As suggested, much more critical is the attitude of the local project director and the particular field representatives of the sponsor. Follow Through as a generic special program mandating parent involvement, the PAC and the teaching aide program have been the critical carriers of the Follow Through treatment in regard to parents.

Yet the educational auspices of Follow Through have been a significant factor in determining the effects on parents. First, the early education image of Follow Through has served to legitimate aide through the schools to lower-income families in communities hostile to such people. Second, the educational component has served to deputize the school systems (often reluctantly) as advocates for some lower income families and, third, the early education atmosphere has been critical in filtering out women, particularly housewives, as the primary recipients of Follow Through services

and focus. Follow Through has been important in some communities as one of the few opportunities for lower income women not only to achieve recognition and some advancement, but also to work with and help other lower income women to do the same.

Teacher Effects

The interviews from the two sites where teachers were interviewed suggest that some teachers have likewise been affected by the Follow Through program. Like parents, the effects on teachers have varied across types of effect and site characteristics although unlike parents the degree of effects appears less dramatic and less clearly identified as a result of Follow Through. Parents were viewed as both agents of the program and recipients of its services and it appears that they have been affected in both ways. Teachers, on the other hand, appear less affected by the program than affectors of the program. Where they volunteer to become Follow Through teachers and where they are specifically picked by parents or project directors because of their compatibility with program objectives and orientations it can not be expected that the program will have the same dramatic effect upon the teacher as is reported in some parent cases. For instance, a teacher who is openly sympathetic to the Bank Street approach from the beginning is not going to see the Bank Street model as the cause of major re-orientations. Such teachers are more likely to see the Bank Street approach as an opportunity to do things in a manner they have long hoped to try. For such teachers Follow Through is important as an opportunity for effect and less as the motivating cause of effect.

Nevertheless, teacher effects do exist. They too can be classed into several types of effects including:

a) The character of classroom practices. Teacher always note the effects of the teaching aide in the classroom which permits more individual attention to children, more of a sense of control, a psychological support and a caretaker of routine duties. Teachers also note the additional

resources in the way of equipment and additional, particularly psychological testing, services.

b) The character of teacher-parent relations. The more frequent contact with parents is prized in most cases, though in particular cases teachers feel such contact to be an additional pressure. Increased parent contact provides the teacher with more information about the child and an increased opportunity to offer advice and example in affecting changes in the parent-child relationship.

c) The character of professional relations. Follow Through appears to offer a teacher a sense of special status among peers. Both the experimental and the innovative aspects of the program give a special identity to Follow Through teachers in their schools. This special identity also serves to separate (and segregate) Follow Through teachers from conventional teachers. This appears to bring on a subtle unease marked by both a sense of being resented and a guilt over the acceptance of special status. The special identity as a professional minority plus the group training sessions and occasional Follow Through staff meetings can weld the Follow Through teachers together into a self-conscious professional sub-group which meets together for support and the maintenance of a group esprit de corps. Such self-conscious groupness may reinforce the Follow Through/Non-Follow Through teacher distinction. Finally, the structure of the Follow Through program provides the teacher with divided supervision. Being responsible to both the school administration and the Follow Through administration may provide greater freedom where supervisors can be played off against each other, and greater security where teachers disagree with administrators, although it may also provide an increase in pressure to perform well.

d) The character of personal and educational development. Follow Through has facilitated the efforts of some teachers to expand and develop their teaching techniques and areas of competence. The sponsor training has been of direct value here, but also teachers report how exploring new programs in Follow Through has led them to go on and further their personal and professional development in advanced college programs, professional workshops and human services institutes.

## 6.0 REVIEW OF PREVIOUS APPROACHES

Each of these four research approaches offers potentials for a study of parent and teacher effects. In this section the approaches will be reviewed by assessing the actual use made of each approach in the Follow Through evaluation. Each of the approaches has behind it a substantial literature on its theory and application. There are several texts which review these and other approaches and provide assessments of their various strengths and weaknesses in their general form.[29] It is not intended here to organize this review in such a general manner. This review of the approaches is confined to the manner in which they have been employed Follow Through evaluation.

Specific criteria relevant to the program have been developed and the review here only considers the approaches as they compare with each other in terms of these various criteria. The various methods will not be considered separately, but only comparatively in terms of these criteria.

### 6.1 Criteria of Assessment

Given the character of the Follow Through program, what criteria would be most relevant for assessing various research approaches directed

---

29/ Adequate treatments can be found in Norman K. Denzin, The Research Act: A Theoretical Discussion of Sociological Methods (Chicago: Aldine, 1970) and Leon Festinger and Daniel Katz, eds., Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953).

toward parent and teacher effects? The wide variation by site and by sponsor in the program's approach toward parents and teachers suggests that comparability without regard for variations in site implementation will be questionable. The wide range of parent experiences with the program even within sites will be problematic with regard to comparability of effects. The enormous range of special meanings and differences in impact and value that various effects may have for different individuals poses issues of generalization and representativeness. The size of the population involved in Follow Through and its geographic spread across the nation pose major administrative and cost problems in research design. Finally, the relatively secondary and uncertain objectives which lay behind parent participation in Follow Through lead to questions of policy relevance and potential for impact of various research approaches.

In view of these considerations, five criteria have been selected for reviewing the research approaches. These include

a. Generalizability. To what degree has the approach produced findings which are representative of the various populations of interest?

b. Comparability. To what degree has the approach produced data that can be compared across sponsors or sites?

c. Reliability and Validity. To what degree has the approach produced findings that are replicable, verifiable, stable and true indicators of effects?

d. Cost. How much does the approach cost to produce reasonable findings?

e. Policy Relevance. To what degree has the approach produced findings that are useful to various policy makers?

6.2 Review by Criteria

In the five sections which follow each of the criteria will be considered separately as a means of assessing the approaches.

A. Generalizability

Generalizability here refers to the degree to which research findings can be held as representative of the various populations of interest. The problem with generalizing from any approach is complicated by the wide divergence of treatments which the Follow Through program provides. Generalizations to the national Follow Through population are barely less tenable than generalizations within sponsors or sites. It would not be surprising to discover that the variations in effects among parents at a given site are as wide as the variations in effects across sponsors. Clearly some parents with children in Follow Through show absolutely no sign of effect. (I interviewed two such parents in Northville.) For others the program has brought about major changes in their lives. Expecting generalized effects across all parents would be unreasonable. It is this assumption which has resulted in the rather insignificant findings of the SRI and Abt analysis in terms of parent effects. Differences in program effects on a Follow Through/Non-Follow Through basis do not capture the wide variations. If the parent population was desegregated into classes of parents receiving specific types of treatment (such as PAC chairmen, teacher aides, college course takers, users of dental services, etc.) perhaps these findings would be more striking and more generalizable across types, but such cross tabular analysis has not been tried. 30/

---

30/ The SRI cross tabular analysis of teacher data did not analyze data by type of teacher. Type of treatment was represented by sponsor groupings, but, as noted, the assumption that common sponsor means common treatment is fairly gross.

It is possible to consider teachers as more likely to experience a common treatment participating in Follow Through. Yet from what can be determined, the Follow Through treatment of teachers has not been so unique as to demonstrate distinct treatment/non-treatment differences. The Abt analysis of the teacher questionnaire data reveals few and rather small differences. The SRI cross-tabular analysis also provides only a few significant Follow Through/Non-Follow Through differences. The differences that do appear in terms of teacher values, attitudes or behavior seem plausibly accounted for by the characterisitcs of the teachers who are selectively attracted to the Follow Through assignments. Younger, less experienced, less salaried teachers who are more likely to be from minority backgrounds and live in the neighbhorhood perhaps are more likely to be senstive to ethnic pride, appreicate parent involvement and be more child centered prior to any sponsor training program. By not conducting base line surveys before teachers enter the sponsors' training programs such explanations can not be tested. Thus Follow Through/Non-Follow Through differences can not be safely called effects of the Follow Through program on Follow Through teachers.

Yet the survey approach is the most conducive to generalizability and representativeness. The careful efforts by NORC to sample parents on a random basis and not to over weight the population with more than 110 interviews per site even in large sites suggests the degree to which survey data gathering can provide foundations for generalizations. But in using the standard survey approach across the entire national sample the possibility of elicitng the distinctive and interesting effects of

Follow Through are all but washed out into bland Follow Through/Non-Follow Through differences. It can not be assumed that having a child in Follow Through is a sufficient indicator that all parents have received a special Follow Through treatment. To do so appears to diminish the significant effects some parents have received who actively and aggressively became involved in Follow Through activities.

Neither the classroom observation nor the unobtrusive measures study goes far in terms of generalization either. Where the selection of sites is not randomized, there is always the possibility that the selection process biases the evidence. Generalization from a stratified sample must reflect the limits imposed by the categories. But the major problem is again that wide variations of effect within the sites wash out when generalized to Follow Through populations as a whole.

The field study is potentially the worst approach in terms of representativeness. In revealing a lot about a little it offers little security for generalizing. SRI's community studies were selected from classes of community types, but this still leaves the selection open to bias. (In fact, the SRI initial selection was reduced from fifteen to nine sites due to logistic and budgetary constraints. Such administrative constraints do not help in maintaining representativness.) The sites selected for this study's field interviewing were selected more in hopes that they were extremes of their type rather than representative. This also does not aid generalizability. If anything, the actual interview, particularly with parents, generally revealed how various were their experiences with Follow Through and how inaccurate broad generalizations might be.

In overview, none of the approaches offers great strength in generalizability. Some simply are not well designed for offering representativeness. But mostly, the problem is that neither the program nor the effects appears generalizable across the nation.

B. Comparability

Comparability here refers to the degree to which collected data has potential for comparative analysis. Comparability is also greatly affected by variations of treatment. Yet here this can be worked to an advantage. Where the variations are intentional as they are in a planned variation experiment, comparing results across sponsors could provide insight into how program variables influence outcome variables. This was one objective in both the Abt analysis and in the SRI cross tabular analysis. The Abt analysis did not try to compare responses by sponsor directly, but rather compared degree of difference between Follow Through and Non-Follow Through respondents by sponsor. Variations were assumed to be standardized to the non-treatment controls and thus problems of item for item comparability could be reduced. The SRI cross tabular analysis does compare analysis of the teacher questionnaire responses directly sponsor by sponsor and also compares these responses by sponsor in terms of deviations from the Follow Through average percentages and the Non-Follow Through comparison group percentages.

But comparability only makes sense where there are definable differences in population conditions or treatment. We might wish to compare Follow Through effects over urban-rural differences or regional differences or by income level of parent. Differences by treatment are more difficult to define for parents and teachers. Planned variation has been directed

at children, not parents or teachers. The treatment of parents and teachers has differed across sponsors, but this has been a secondary result of the planned variation design. The parent and teacher treatments have not been defined (less true for teachers than parents) for determining comparability of effects. In fact, some of the field study and unobtrusive measures study findings suggest that there may be as much variation in parent effects within sponsors (or sites) as there is between them.

The classroom observation approach was designed specifically to produce comparable data across sites and sponsors. Unfortunately, sponsor categories were taken as the only indicator of treatment differences and thus the range of actual teacher experiences was not revealed. This need be only a small problem. The fine detail of standardized observation available in the classroom observation techniques offers a rich data base for comparative analysis. This approach shows the greatest potential in this area.

It was on the issue of comparability that Hargroves found the greatest limitations in the site records. Records kept at one site were kept differently at another site. Categories were defined differently at different sites.

Comparability is also a major drawback of the field studies. SRI developed categories for interview responses in a semi-structured interview guide in order to gain some comparable data, but the general means of open field studies does not typically result in unit to unit comparability. Rather, field studies carried out for comparative analysis are better at revealing types of conditions or similarities among phenomena in quite varied settings.

It is in the larger, more holistic aspects of subjects that field studies produce findings. Comparing specific fragments of parent or teacher experience from field interviews is risky.

Comparing attributes of individuals across sites as done in the SRI and Abt analyses leaves problems as well. The subject becomes fragmented into sets of factors which no longer well represent the person. This is a central problem with the survey, classroom behavior and unobtrusive measures approaches. In reading the reports one has no sense of real people underneath them. Learning that a significant number of Follow Through teachers are younger, less experienced and less well paid than non-Follow Through teachers tells one little about whether these are the attributes that make for a well rounded high quality teacher. For that matter, such findings give little idea about whether a Follow Through teacher is aware of being younger, less experienced and less well salaried and whether she resents this condition or how she overcomes it among her peers and how it may affect her work. Comparative analysis of factors can lead to assumptions that people are actually aware of such factors and that their comparative assessment of such factors actually affects behavior.

C. Validity and Reliability

Assessing the validity and reliability of evidence should be easiest with survey data. Reliability could be checked on a test-retest basis or by administering instruments in several comparable forms. Validity

could be checked by testing the predictive capability of an instrument or simply asking respondents if interview items actually elicit what the instrument design has intended. The accounts of constructing and administering the various instruments used in the national Follow Through surveys make no mention of the implementation or type of validity tests used to check the various instruments. Coefficients of internal consistency among instrument items carried out during the analysis of the data are the only noted tests run to check reliability. Yet this analysis does not consider stability of response over time. It is therefore difficult to assess the validity or reliability of the national survey instruments from the reports of their implementation and analysis.

On the other hand, during the field interviewing conducted for this study some effort was made to examine the validity issue in regard to the 1974 parent interview guide. Sixteen items were selected from the 1974 parent interview guide covering both parent attitude and behavior. In Southville these sixteen items were presented to three Follow Through mothers as routinely as possible. Afterwards the mothers were asked to reflect upon what they meant by their various responses. Generally, those questions which related to direct behavior ("Do you work in any school--either as a volunteer or for pay?") received short, direct unambiguous answers which in retrospect meant exactly what one would hope. Several questions which required special knowledge of programs or Follow Through elicited some confusion. One mother who answered "no" incorrectly to a

question asking if her child had been in Head Start before kindergarten in retrospect explained she had answered no because she thought kindergarten came before Head Start. This same mother in response to a question about the highest grade Follow Through goes to had answered "first", because she identified the Follow Through program with a particular school building. After first grade, in this case, Follow Through children move to another school building. In other cases, such as whether or not there is a sponsor, parents noted that they had hit on the correct answer by a simple guess. In questions asking for opinions or attitudes each of the mothers noted interesting qualifiers and conditions which made their simple "agree-disagree" answers less than solid. In answer to whether parents should go to the PAC with their problems two of the mothers were very particular about what kind of problems the PAC should be expected to handle. On the reactive items ("A person shouldn't plan ahead because things don't usually work out") each of the mothers offered qualifiers and one answered one way and explained her answer in a contradictory form suggesting significant confusion. This confusion is particularly critical because it was the scores from these reactive items that make up the cluster variable the Abt analysis calls the "locus of control".

The SRI staff recognized that reliability was a crucial issue in the development of the classroom observation procedures. The instability of the classroom processes and the variability of observer accuracy were both seen as contributing to error in reporting. Therefore four tests were developed to check the degree to which observation procedures were followed, classroom processes remained stable from day to day, the coding scheme was confusable and observer bias was introduced. Reliability on the following of observational procedures was checked by comparing the expected and actual number of observations recorded by a recorder per day. This source of error proved inconsequential. The stability of classroom processes was checked by computing correlations among a subset of variables for two days of observation. A reliability coefficient was computed and variance unaccounted for was assumed to represent error. A high degree of reliability was found for the stability of classroom processes. Reliability of codes was checked by comparing coding trials recorded by different individuals of video skits of simulated classroom behavior. Reliability on code confusion generally was good although several codes were revealed as sources of error. Two procedures, the videotaped skits and paired observations, were used to assess observer accuracy. Reliability among observers was found to be fair, though the two procedures differed in what they revealed as sources of error. In general the classroom observation approach was found to be acceptably reliable with the greatest sources of error derived from coding confusion and observer bias.

The field studies do not rank high in terms of reliability or validity. Neither the SRI community studies nor Huron's study addressed issues of reliability directly.

Validity may be improved in the field study where an interviewer has a chance to probe and openly explore the meanings of responses in interview setting. But in this case both reliability and validity are confounded by the potential for interviewer bias which in the field study is great. Interviewer bias might be reduced and validity improved where interviewers work in teams and reliability might be improved where interviewees are interviewed twice by different teams of interviewers. But this is seldom done and both the SRI community studies and this study's field interviews are left open to questions of reliability and validity.

D. Cost

Costs must be considered both alone and in relation to effectiveness. Where there are budgetary limits of how much funds can be expended certain approaches simply can not be attempted. The broad national surveys are quite expensive in data gathering, although the price per unit of information is relatively low. Field studies are also significantly

---

31/ Detailed figures on these costs in Follow Through are not available as they are considered proprietary information.

costly. Generally the larger the data gathering effort, the greater the administrative machinery needed and the greater the costs.

In terms of the effect one gets for the cost, a great deal depends upon the objectives. The decision to collect parent and teacher data on the same broad national base as data collected on children derived from the desire to use such data as background and mediating variables in the study of child effects. But as noted above, a study of parent or teacher effects need not be determined by the requirements of the planned variation experiments. If the range of effects may be as great within sites as between sites, especially in regard to parents, the survey samples necessary to adequately analyze parent or teacher effects need not be anywhere as large as the national samples.

The unobtrusive measures approach is advocated for its cost-effectiveness. By employing data already collected it reduced research costs (although the cost of what data is collected is still there--in design terms, it is a program budget subsidy to the research budget). But as Hargroves discovered, the price is the acceptance of uneven, often non-comparable, frequently inaccurate and missing records.

E. Policy Relevance

Good applied social research should bear on policy. Such research should address questions which are important to policy makers and over which they will have policy discretion. The criterion is not one of content alone; the means of research approach should also reflect the needs.

interest and knowledge of policy makers. Some policy questions are illuminated by in-depth analysis, while others require broad, representative findings. Unfortunately all of this is easier stated than implemented. Frequently the policy making audience is ill defined, diffuse or varied in its interests. Policy relevance itself is best defined in the eyes of the policy makers and what is relevant to one actor may not be relevant to another. Besides policy makers change over time as do their needs and interests.

One of the principle problems associated with research other than the child effects evaluation in Follow Through has been the difficulty of establishing policy relevance. 32/ Certainly this has been true of much of the research on parents and teachers as well. The SRI Community Studies are a good case in point. The study started out focusing upon program implementation at the sites and ended up studying the role and impact of parent participation. The reorganization of the evaluation seemed to have left even that function at a dead end. No one was left asking policy questions about parent participation who was in a position to alter situations and who actually desired to alter those situations.

---

32/ Neither the NTL study of support services nor the Bio-Dynamics study of health services appears to have had major effect on program policy even though both reports offered many significant policy recommendations. Several reasons may be suggested for this, but a major one lies in the non-central character of support services in program policy. See Robert S. Fox, et al., An Examination of Support Systems in Selected Follow Through Schools, Washington, D.C.: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, March, 1971 and Thomas F. Sullivan, Health Care Delivery in Project Follow Through, Cambridge, MA: Bio-Dynamics, November, 1970.

Jeannette Hargroves reported the same sense about the unobtrusive measures study. The Office of Education evaluation staff were interested and supportive of the study, but it was never clear what would be the effect of her study. The service program staff at the Office of Education were committed to parent participation and doing what they could to encourage it. (More could have been done, for instance, funding for the establishment of a national PAC could have been tried, but this was politically infeasable as is suggested in the next section.)

Another problem with the various research approaches in terms of policy is how little they connect effects to values. In terms of policy we might like to know which effects are considered benefits and which are considered disbenefits by those who experience the effects. Policy deals with values as well as outcomes. We can not assume that all effects are valued equally or even that all effects are valued positively. To some parents a little financial aid with dental bills may be much more highly regarded than improvements in reading scores. To others the stigma of Follow Through as a "welfare" program or the continual demands of parent evening meetings may be considered real disadvantages of being involved with Follow Through. In fact, there may be a latent positive assumption about effects underlying the items on the parent interview guide, the teacher questionnaire and the unobtrusive measures indicator selection. Items and measures are not provided which would elicit undesirable and unintended consequences of Follow Through.

If, for the purposes of this review, policy relevance is defined pragmatically, then to what degree did the approaches effect program policy?[33/] As already noted the community studies and the unobtrusive measures study had very little to no impact on policy. Neither the classroom observation study nor the national parent and teacher surveys were designed to effect program policy. Both were implemented primarily to provide background for explaining the observed child effects. Neither approach has resulted in recommendations on policy toward parents and teachers and generally it appears safe to note that neither has had an effect on such policies. In sum, none of these approaches seems to have had a direct effect on program policy. Their potential for policy effect is another issue.

The unobtrusive measures approach suggests great potential as it works directly with the records and materials that local policy makers themselves use to assess their performance. Likewise, the field study, because of its comprehensive potential and its developmental character, offers advantages in being able to respond to changing policy interests as they arise or are discovered even where prior planning has been ignorant of such issues. The survey methods are better at defining baseline and background characteristics than responding to the frequently changing needs of policy makers. In terms of policy relevance, then, the more pre-structured the techniques the less adequate the approach. The unobtrusive measures approach appears strong as does the field study directed toward policy making processes. Such a field study is suggested in the next section.

---

33/ It is clear that evaluation studies have had impact on evaluation policy, but here, the concern is with the link between research approach and program policy.

## 7.0 THE POLITICAL BEHAVIOR APPROACH

Each of the approaches reviewed thus far have shared the goal of providing objective and unbiased insight into the subject of their study. The pursuit of the objectively pure approach to program research offers many values, but it is not always necessary in the study of program effects. In programs like Follow Through there is ample room for program participants to make their own subjective assessment of the program's effects and convert such attitudes into actions designed to affect policy making. Program researchers are frequently too quick to reject this valuable resource, because it involves "politics" and is too subjective. Yet political behavior is a constant and unavoidable factor of program implementation. There is nothing inherently inadequate about data generated by studying the political behavior of program participants. In fact such an approach may be much stronger in terms of some criteria at eliciting program effects. If parents and teachers are the best authorities on how Follow Through has affected their lives, perhaps a study of their specific attempts to affect policy may provide very inexpensive, holistic and policy relevant information.

Other approaches have looked for program effects on participants by analyzing indicators such as questionnaire responses, program records or classroom behavior. This approach simply uses evidence of policy

relevant behavior as another indicator of program effects. The political behavior of parents and teachers becomes a key to their own perceived effects. This section reviews such a political behavior approach to the study of parent and teacher effects.

## 7.1 The Huron Political Behavior Study

A brief feasibility study of the political behavior of parents and teachers was conducted under this review during the spring of 1976. This study required an examination of the types and degree of effects parents and teachers have had on policy making at both the local and national level. Strategically it appeared best to range widely in an exploration, leaving more detailed case analysis to a future study. The evidence of the effects of parents and teachers upon program policy was gathered at the three sites visited and during a special field visit in Washington, D. C. The interviews in Washington were conducted with Office of Education staff members in the program office of the Follow Through Division, in the evaluation office and in the budget division office within the Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation and among various legislative assistance and staff members in both the House and Senate. In total seven administrative staff members and six legislative staff members were consulted.

## 7.2 Political Behavior at the Local Level

In each of the three sites visited Policy Advisory Committees were in existence and actively functioning. PAC's clearly vary a great deal in their effectiveness as policy making bodies. Other site visit reports have described PAC's which seldom met, were poorly attended or appeared little more than rubber stamps for project directors. Conversely other stories tell of PAC's particularly in New York and Chicago which are powerful influences in many program policies. The PAC's in operation at the sites visited in this study (I only saw one full PAC meeting) appeared to be at neither extreme. In one site, Northville, the PAC was considering among several agenda items how to address a recent school administration proposal which would have moved the Follow Through offices and parent center from their present facility, a two-story wood frame house into a second larger house where they would share facilities with other school programs. The sense of the parents was to resist this reorganization and with the project directors' advice they made plans on how to approach the upcoming school board meeting and offer their objections and alternative plans. (In a follow-up visit I learned that over 40 parents showed up at the school board meeting and the decision was postponed until a second meeting where the presence of an equally large number of parents resulted in further postponement of the decision.) A second agenda item which came up during this particular PAC meeting was a letter received from a state legislator which was a response to a letter written by the PAC in support of the continuation of funding for

the local community college which several of the parents were attending. The legislators' response was considered inadequate by the parents, who voted to reply with a more pointed support letter. During this discussion the project director was silent.

Such observations suggest that parents in some PAC's are politically sensitive, capable of strategy and aggressively active not only in local community policy making which might affect the Follow Through program, but also in larger state politics. These observations were supported in the site interviews. Many of the Northville parents remember a long protracted community conflict several years ago in which they fought in the school board and town meeting a conservative drive to discontinue the Follow Through program. Some parents reported the events in great detail, complete with strategies and post mortems. Further, when asked about political letter writing several parents and teachers at both Northville and Southville remembered a period several years ago where there was a threat of funding cuts at the federal level where they wrote many letters and even made phone calls. The project director at Northville remembers that at this time the PAC considered plans for chartering a bus and traveling to Washington with the express purpose of influencing federal legislators. In informal discussion in Southville two school administrators saw several of the parents as active in school board hearings. Most of the parents interviewed in Hometown remembered attending

school board meetings to protest various actions, specifically the cutting back of bus services. One woman in Northville became politically active in the PAC and moved on to run for and win a school board position. In fact, it was reported that currently four out of the five school board positions in Northville were filled by persons who had had Follow Through experience either as parents or teachers.

These observations are further supported by the recollections of project officers at the Office of Education. Those familiar with site implementation noted cases where parents have been active in forcing the resignation of teachers and project directors, cases where parents have been active in determining the degree to which sponsor models would be adapted to local desires and where sponsor personnel were replaced, and cases where parent activity has resulted in changes in the manner and personnel employed by the Office of Education program office in monitoring the sites. One case was even reported where parents organized against the mandates of the local school board and brought about a law suit to compel the school board to act upon their desires to develop the program as they saw fit. In another community it was reported that Follow Through parents organized a protest march upon the school board and later upon the mayor's office in order to forestall the closing of a Follow Through school.

Federal intentions as laid out in the 1969 program manual clearly envisioned parent involvement and the PAC in particular as a means to guaranteeing local consumer accountability. Parents were to be involved in local policy making. Their opinions and desires were to be consulted an

respected. But those guidelines never went so far as to suggest the program's policy was to be controlled by parents. The ultimate authority was yet to lay with the local educational agency. In the vast majority of cases this distinction seems to have held. Yet the repertoire of Follow Through stories is not without cases where parents, frequently through the PAC, have made successful efforts to control specifically sensitive features of the programs such as teacher selection, project director selection and particular features of the instructional models. In many other cases parents have actively curbed, initiated or directed the development of policies which were sanctioned or at least tolerated by school administrations and sponsor personnel. The degree to which parents have been effective in local policy making most likely varies greatly across the range of sites, but it clearly has produced some outstanding examples.

The effects of teachers upon local policy is much more difficult to assess. Anecdotes are rare. Federal guidelines never specified teachers as unique participants. Whereas project directors, parents and others seem eager to tell stories of parent participation in policy matters, teacher participation appears to be considered with more hesitancy. The teachers themselves appeared less than enthusiastic about talking about their input into policy. They did note cases where they mutually supported each other in trying to change a policy of the project director or the sponsor's staff. Occasionally a teacher would speak of individual efforts on her part to change the model, relationships with the sponsor's staff, a requirement of the project director or the personnel assigned to her as a teacher aide. Two teachers also noted

that they wrote letters of support to congressmen during the period of the threatened federal funding cuts. Generally, though, teachers did not see themselves functioning as self-conscious political actors in local policy and they did not see themselves as a political interest group. In different sites than those visited where the instructional model is more confining and tightly defined, perhaps teachers might more consciously identify themselves as a group with particular group interest vis-á-vis the sponsor or school system, but this was not apparent in the sites visited. Generally the teachers interviewed saw themselves as Follow Through teachers by choice with few grievances about the situation that they could not address through individual professional channels. Political action was seldom called for.

## 7.3 Political Behavior at the National Level

Whatever political action parents and teachers performed at the local level, at least in terms of parents it could be assumed to be sanctioned by the federal mandate to encourage parent participation in program policy. The same can not be said about political action at the national level. Within the Office of Education the primary character of the Follow Through program remained an enigma. Some saw the program as primarily a social service and compensatory education program which had to be couched in terms of an experiment in order to receive congressional support and some saw the program as primarily an innovative experiment designed to test various early education models, most of which had social service components or were required to supply social services as a carrot in order to gain community acceptance.[34/] Whatever the broad divergence of policy goals might suggest within the Office of Education, it was never intended that outsiders, particularly parents, might also have input into determining program character. True, in the early 1970's, representative parents were occasionally included in Follow Through conferences and annual meetings, but all that may have been hoped for here was a little consumer representation and a chance to hear parent opinions. When, by 1973, a National PAC was becoming more effective and parent involvement in national Follow Through meetings

---

34/ For further development of this schism see several articles, particularly Richard Elmore's, in Alice M. Rivlin and P. Michael Timpane, eds., Planned Variation in Education: Should We Give Up or Try Harder (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1975).

was becoming openly disruptive of established policy making processes the open invitation to parent participation was not renewed. Policies concerning Follow Through within the Office of Education were officially technical matters and not the province of parental determination. Yet closing parents out of national Follow Through policy within the Office of Education was not fatal to the efforts of parents to effect Follow Through policy. During the spring of 1974 an event occurred which for most federal observers marks the most significant evidence of the effects of parents on national Follow Through policy. In most interviews where this study attempted to find evidence of parents as political actors the events of the spring of 1974 were the principle references.

Case 1: The 1974 Program Phase Out Story.

The story begins in several places. Some note it began as an election year budget cut. Some see it as the natural course of those who saw Follow Through as an experiment. By 1973 the primary target cohort of children would have entered the treatment system and been on their way through the four-year program. After them it was no longer necessary to collect data. Thus, at the time, it seemed it was no longer necessary to process youngsters into the treatment. The natural steps would be to phase out the program in year by year steps beginning with kindergarten and progressing on up. Assuming that everyone shared the experimental view of Follow Through, the logic should have been clear and acceptable. But, not everyone did share this view. For one there was no such consensus in the Follow Through program office. In fact, during the fall of 1972 a reasonable termination of Follow Through had been considered in a plan which would have phased out the program by phasing it into the conventional Title I program. Each grade lost from Follow Through would be picked up by Title I, which was eager to develop a research element. Although this plan was never fully developed it was the offering the Office of Education staff were prepared to present at the Fall 1972 National Follow Through Conference at Denver. This conference was to provide a major review of Follow Through policy for sponsors, consultants and parents from throughout the country. But at the last minute plans were stalled and the Denver conference opened with the Office of Education staff providing the assembled anxious sponsors and angry parents only a phase out plan for Follow Through's future. The Denver conference had boiled over and several weeks later an assembly of Follow Through parents traveled to

Washington to meet with the Commissioner of Education to present their protest over the planned phase out of Follow Through. This proved ineffective. The administration budget released in the spring of 1974 proposed a $12 mission cut in Follow Through funds for FY'75. The reaction was swift and effective. Closed out of OE policy making, parents moved into other arenas.

The sponsors organized a technical presentation of their work for the Educational Staff Seminar which served many administrative and legislative staff members as the informal information gathering forum for new ideas and practices in education. Parents and project directors moved upon the legislature. Visits, letters and phone calls to congressmen soon paid off. Senator Walter Mondale and staff members of the Senate's Special Committee on Children and Youth were particularly impressed by the parental support for Follow Through. (One staff member noted that the parental support was far more persuasive than the sponsor presentation at the Educational Staff Seminar.) Mondale soon let it be known that he would sponsor a supplemental appropriations bill reinstating the Follow Through funds and specifically forbidding the phase out. Mondale went on to broaden the sponsorship and make it bipartisan. The parents and sponsor joined forces. Major letter campaigns were organized producing what one legislative aide called "a flood of mail" which he defined as over 40 or 50 letters a day. Strategically one of the sponsors organized a parent involvement workshop in Washington. With the aid of the Children's Defense Fund they organized a seminar in legislative

processes held on Capitol Hill. Finally parents and project directors came to Washington to testify. The record of the House Committee on Appropriations contains parent testimony in support of Follow Through offered on three different days in May.[35/] This outpouring of parent, sponsor and project director support proved effective. In late May of 1974 the supplemental bill passed and the phase out was averted. Interpretations of the value and meaning of this program continuation differ, but staff members at the Office of Education as well as in the legislature agree that the political efforts of the parents were the critical factor in the aversion of the 1974 phase out.

Case 2: The 1974 Changes in Regulations Story.

A similar episode occurred in relation to the Follow Through guidelines. Early in March of 1974 the Federal Register published the draft regulations for Follow Through. Originating in the Office of Education, these regulations referred to the program as "experimental" and noted the planned "phase out". Project directors quickly passed these regulations on to the activist parents. The required public hearing on the proposed regulations was held in Washington at the close of March. Several parents traveled to Washington to voice their opposition to this wording. In addition some 800 written statements were received and considered. The register itself notes "virtually all the comments received expressed opposition to the characterization of Follow Through... as 'experimental,' and expressed

---

35/ U.S. House of Representatives, Hearing before the Sub-Committee on Appropriations, Testimony of Witnesses, Washington, D.C. May, 1974.

opposition to the contemplated phase out..." [36/] In the final regulations this language was deleted.

Case 3: The 1975 Funding Cut-Back Story

This story is less developed because it appears to have been less dramatic and less significant in the minds of those interviewed. Again in the spring of 1975 the administration budget proposed the diminishment of program funds for Follow Through. The Office of Education claimed it would not be able to use additional funds even if appropriated as the program was to be cut back. Instead of phasing the program out the strategy this year was to selectively drop sites which did not meet certain criteria. Strategically it might have been hoped this would fragment the anti-phase out coalition. It, too, proved ineffective. Parental support was again organized. Letters, calls and visits followed and again the Follow Through funds were reinstated to their previous level. Again parent political activity was seen as primarily responsible.

Such dramatic cases were quick to come to mind when federal level personnel were asked to provide evidence of parent political activity. Yet the true significance of parents as agents of political effect may well come about in a more subtle and less seasonal manner. It is not merely by national drama that federal education policy is set. Activities at the local level do appear to affect policy at the national level through

---

[36/] U.S. Federal Register, Vol. 39, No. 121 (June 21, 1974) p. 22342.

the district legislator and his or her aides. Personnel at both Northville and Southville mentioned efforts to communicate with their district legislators and keep them informed of the successes of their programs. The typical channel for this is letters from the PAC and invitations from the PAC to encourage site visits for congressmen.

In order to assess the impact of this communication between parents and their legislators, interviews were conducted with three legislative aides concerning the basis for their congressmen's feelings about Follow Through. Of the three all knew of Follow Through and supported the program. One senator's aide noted that the Senator supported all early childhood education programs on principle. The Senator was personally committed to federal early education programs and reports from Follow Through sites in his state only further confirmed his feelings. A second aide noted that Follow Through was simply a highly visible program. Considering the relatively small size of the funding (relative to Title I as an example) this legislator was always impressed with the amount of mail and frequent visits he received from parents in support of the program. The legislative aide noted that the mail from parents in support of Follow Through not only stood out in volume, but in degree of sophistication. Often she noted that letters were quite detailed, personal and to the point about just how the program worked. She noted that whoever advised these parents knew how to organize successful letter campaigns.

The third congressional aide was even more candid and clear. He noted that his congressman had been invited by a district PAC to visit the local Follow Through classrooms. Upon the visit the congressman was provided a lunch organized by the PAC and awarded a plaque as a momento. Later in the year this aide and the congressman attended a parent involvement workshop. Here they had listened to parent after parent speak of how much Follow Through meant to them and how much the program had done to help them improve their life situation. One woman in particular was remembered as recounting her remarkable story as a climb up from welfare recipient to a credentialed and employed teacher aide. In this legislative aide's mind this testamonial alone made Follow Through a worthwhile program. He compared Follow Through to Title I which he saw as bogged down in red tape and audits. He admitted that this year when the new proposed budget arrived on his desk, the first program he looked for was Follow Through. Soon thereafter this congressman sent off a letter to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee protesting the proposed cut in Follow Through funds.

While it was certainly interesting to hear these congressional aides note the basis for their support of Follow Through of even greater interest is what they neglected to mention as evidence. None of them mentioned the national evaluation, the planned variation approach or the experimental setting. None mentioned the existing national evaluation reports nor did they mention the future release of the most recent evaluation

findings. To them Follow Through appeared as an early education service program which was relatively inexpensive and overwhelmingly popular among constituents. Two aides noted positively that the program also served lower income people, which as one aide put it, "meets our prejudices about lower income people as well." The other aide noted it was not simply a "give away" program--there were relatively little free services. Thus a program that is relatively inexpensive, popular and directed at lower income families seems to engender legislative support and the evidence upon which this support rides appears to come primarily from the parents and others who keep the legislators informed about their feelings. The support parents manifest at the local level, combined with the dramatic support parents demonstrated when Follow Through funds are in jeopardy, appears to play a significant part in the determination of federal policy toward the program.

7.4 Review of Political Behavior Approach

By examining the policy relevant political behavior of program recipients, the political behavior approach offers a different perspective on program effects than do the earlier research approaches. The program recipient is not divided into a collection of factors over which indiciators of effect may range. Instead of such fragmantation, the individual is viewed holistically as a self-aware evaluator of his or her own benefits and disbenefits. The problem of converting program effects into overall values is resolved as various individuals compute their own "utilities" in regard to the program. In fact, the whole notion of policy relevance is made clear and specific. The political support for Follow Through arose directly out of those benefits which invidual parents felt were most relevant to themselves. In searching out the means of formulating their political support they examined alternative strategies for affecting policy and located those that were most relevant. Thus, parents learned that their pleasure and satisfaction with the program were not relevant factors in policy making within the administration of the Office of Education. Instead they found their views more relevant on Capitol Hill. Such questions as what is policy relevant and to whom are resolved simply by examining the actions of program participants.

The political behavior approach does not reveal effects generalizable to the total population. Yet the activist parents form their own sub group. Their behavior is indicative of effects of Follow Through among those who most consider the program as a benefit. The evidence that parent support for Follow Through came from programs under a wide range of sponsors,

throughout the regions of the country and from rural as well as urban sites suggests that there is something consistently beneficial about Follow Through regardless of sponsor, region or size of community. The politically active parents represented all conditions of the program. Such political behavior requires a great sense of personal efficacy. In order to generate the amount of support shown for Follow Through, those parents who did participate must have sensed the quiet support of many others who could not or would not risk political behavior. Each parent who traveled to Washington must in some political way have been representative of many who did not.

A political behavior study can be a relatively inexpensive means of gathering data. By focusing in on policy making settings and waiting to see who participates, in what manner and over what issues, one can have a natural selecting process, whereby only the issues most relevant and only the recipients most likely to show beneficial effects arise. Through a careful selection of policy making settings one can cover a broad range of population types and comparable conditions without sampling a large population.

How valid or reliable is political behavior data in studying program effects? It is as valid or reliable as most field interview data and maybe somewhat more so because it focuses on direct behavior instead of attitudes or motivations for behavior. Particularly because the subject involves political behavior, respondents may well exaggerate, bias or cover over reports of behavior. Reliability can be checked by interviewing several participants about each particular event and then presenting only that information which meets some standard such as "agreed to by three or

more informants". Political events are typically well remembered (although often exaggerated) and in interviewing it is possible to elicit vivid and very detailed accounts where interviews asking for more general reflection produce less clear and less stable accounts. It can be assumed that with highly sensitive political events, much of the action is inaccessible in interview situations because of issues of trust and deception. Further, the very procedures of a study of political behavior may produce problems in themselves. Respondents and others may become concerned over the "muckraking" or disruptive potentials involved in such studies. Yet sensitive interviewing building upon theories of action as interviews develop along with careful use of evidence can produce stories based in fact which cover even the most political of behavior, without disrupting established patterns of political processes.

Validity is less well established if the analysis is to go beyond simply recording the political events. The meanings of political events are often highly symbolic, ambiguous and open to multiple interpretations. Validity can be checked by returning draft case studies to the persons interviewed in order to check facts as well as interpretations drawn. Better yet is to ask participants directly what they meant by their actions and how their actions related to benefits to their own self interest.

In sum, the political behavior approach to studying social action programs like Follow Through has some strong virtues in considering program effects. Of each of the approaches considered here in this study, none has presented the intensity with which parents feel involved in and affected by Follow Through as strongly as does the study of their political behavior. The political behavior approach has weaknesses, but it does present itself as a credible approach which should be considered as one more reasonable alternative in the study of parent and teacher effects.

## 8.0 CONCLUSIONS: PARENT AND TEACHER EFFECTS

The two objectives laid out for this study suggest that here two questions should be asked: first, are the program effects on parents and teachers worthy of a more developed study than has been currently conducted and, second, if so, what approaches would reveal these effects with greatest insight. In order to answer either of these questions it is necessary to consider the objectives such further study might serve.

One possible objective for studying parent and teacher effects might be product evaluation. Whether or not the evaluation of child effects "proves" the worth of Follow Through, it might be nice to demonstrate that Follow Through is a good program because so many parents and teachers have benefited. A second objective might be a process evaluation. We might be interested in just what happened to parents and teachers during their Follow Through experience. A third objective (not necessarily independent of the previous two) might be a policy analysis. We might want to know things about affecting the lives of parents and teachers which would help us plan future programs. Such objectives need to be set in order to make a final determination of the value of further studies. Setting such objectives is not a technical task; it requires a policy decision, most likely within the Office of Education. Without such broad objectives to guide decision-making it is still possible to make tentative recommendations based on the material covered in this report.

First, is there value in the further study of parent and teacher effects? The quality of the effects themselves provides some answer. The program was never intended to benefit teachers directly as a recipient class. Teachers, like all the other professionals involved in Follow Through, were intended to be affected only as mediators in the service delivery. Many teachers did benefit from Follow Through, due to involvement with the sponsor, as well as due to the direct teaching supplements in the classroom. Yet on the whole the effects were never so exciting or frequently noted as the program effects on parents. In fact, the findings from the survey analysis and this study's field study suggest that teachers were not so greatly affected by the program as they were affectors of the program. Thus special characteristics which set them aside from other of their colleagues have never been proved to be anything more than due to the special selection process involved in their recruitment into Follow Through. Yet even if some of their attitudes and behaviors could be shown to have resulted from specific sponsor training or classroom supplements, such findings would not be central to the purposes of Follow Through. The program was not a teacher training program. Only where changes in teacher attributes affect children are such effects relevant and then the teacher is once again only a mediating variable. On the basis of the rather insignificant demonstration of teacher effects, the possibility that teacher selection is responsible for most perceived differences and the lack of program intentions toward teachers as a recipient class, it does not appear of much value to conduct a major study of teacher effects.

The case for parents is different. While the analyses of the national survey data have not produced much indication of widely felt or exciting effects among parents, the field study and the unobtrusive measures study did discover a large number of exciting and worthy anecdotes. These findings are also well recognized in the program office at the Office of Education and throughout the Follow Through staff of the various sites. Such anecdotes are not difficult to locate and parents are eager to reveal them. Further, the effects of Follow Through on parents as a recipient group is a legitimate objective of the program as intended in the federal guidelines. A study of parent effects could prove of significant value if closely tied to specific goals. In terms of program evaluation, process evalauation or the wider policy analysis, Follow Through's effects on parents appears to be a worthy source of data.

In considering the program effects on parents it is important to confront the major dilemma revealed in this review: the research conducted under the auspices of the national evaluation does not produce findings of program effects on parents congruent with the many field reports and anecdotes. There could be several possible explanations for this. First, the field reports may all originate from such a small and insignificant number of parents that the data are lost in any broad national sample. Second, the objectives of the national survey research, the specific questions asked and the analyses performed were not directed centrally toward eliciting program effects on parents and therefore the data were simply never gathered or developed into such an analysis. Third, the program's effects on parents are so diverse and individually varied that no broad national survey no matter how well directed will provide an adequate description.

Each of these explanations suggests its own orientation to designing appropriate research. The first explanation would suggest a small detailed case study. The second explanation would require a more specifically focused survey. The third explanation would sit somewhere in between.

Earlier in this report it has been noted that the second explanation offers some explanation for the lack of congruity. It has also been suggested above that the third explanation offers significant explanation. It is my judgment based on the field research and particularly the reports of federal-level respondents interviewed during the political behavior study that the first explanation is the least valid. The explanatory potential of the last two explanations offers some insight into the research approaches most valuable in studying parents.

What approaches could explore this data best? The choice of approach itself is affected by the purposes of the research as well. Policy analysis may require a tightly controlled experiment in order to provide base line comparability as well as predictive capabilities. Where learning is concerned we need a careful review of the context as well as new insight. In such a case the more rigorous survey approaches have great strength. The administration of parent interviews every year with particular attention to the earliest base line interviews possible (ideally, parents would be interviewed first in the summer before program entry). Whatever else the study of effects may be, it is a study of change over time. An ideal study of parent effects would require the identification of changes in the condition, attitudes and behavior of parents which occurred during

the period they were involved in Follow Through and which would not have occurred in the absence of involvement with Follow Through. This would require a matched control group, a longitudinal analysis of items of response and, to be complete, an implementation study to determine the specifics of the program as implemented and the unique, non-replicable qualities of the community, school system and historical moment. Such an intense study need not be large. Because there is little intended planned variation in regard to parents, the study might focus on two or three sites in order to maximize control and insight.

The experimental paradigm is not the only model worth considering. If the purposes of the research are directed toward program evaluation such precision and rigor may not be necessary. What is needed is insight into the types, range and frequency of effects. Effects need not be defined so rigorously as to discount effects impossible without the program. Rather effects may be defined as benefits perceived by the recipients (avoiding issues of causality). In this case the political behavior approach may prove a good model. Beginning with identifiable political behavior of parents in Washington, the investigation might follow parents back to their home communities exploring the motivation for political behavior as well as its representativeness among other parents. This study might range widely covering many disparate case studies to support general hypotheses about parent participation, parent benefits and political organization. Such a study need not be costly. Riding on testamonials and self reports, it need not cover different points of time and it need not cover control groups. At the sites located by political behavior more rigorous techniques such as partially structured interviews and reviews of records and documents might be employed.

These two approaches show the most promise in studying parent effects. They are vastly different, but each has strengths worth considering. In order to make a more clear choice, objectives for research on parents need to be established. That they have not been established by now is a result of the unique history of the Follow Through program.

The 1971 decision to reorganize the national evaluation by limiting it and focusing it solely upon the cognitive development of children in a selected sample of sites marked a critical turning point in the evaluation of Follow Through. Much was gained in this reorganization: much was lost. In order to test more rigorously the value of the statistical approach to program evaluation a chance to study much of the looser complexities of the program's output and implementation was lost. The evaluation narrowed, but the program did not. Parents, teachers, project directors, sponsors and school administrators continued to function, learn and even further construct a highly sophisticated and fairly remarkable service delivery program organized around, but not limited to, the quality of education for a select group of early school-age children. Sponsor agencies refined models and training techniques. School administrators integrated Follow Through classes into existing schools and Follow Through model ideas and popularity diffused into other classrooms and community culture. Teachers developed professionally and refined techniques. But most of all, parents grew. Most likely hundreds of parents found fellowship in Follow Through activities. Many continued on in schooling, many received jobs and training, many participated in PAC governance activities, even more received extra social or medical or dental services for their children.

The parents' support for the Follow Through program as a social service program has been a principal factor in maintaining the program funding and providing the local popularity of the program at the community level. In considering the continuation and character of the Follow Through program as a social service program, the absence of research on the program's value to parents leaves future policy making with inadequate research foundations. A study of parent effects either in terms of policy implications or in terms of program evaluation could provide valuable foundations in deciding future program policy or in designing other early childhood education programs that look to parent participation as a meaningful component.

## APPENDIX : FIELD REPORTS FOR HURON FIELD STUDY

The following includes the field reports from each of the three sites visited under this study's field interview approach. The Hometown report covers only parents' responses as no teachers were interviewed there. Teachers and parents were interviewed at Northville and Southville. I greatly appreciate the time and energy all of these fine people, and particularly the project directors, offered me in my effort to carry out these field interviews.

A. SITE 1: HOMETOWN[36/]

The first site was explored on a pre-pilot basis in order to get a feeling for the interview situation. Only parents were interviewed in this first site, yet it is worth considering some of the findings.

Hometown is a medium-sized city well integrated into the central area of a major northeastern metropolitan area. It is a Bank Street site with separate Follow Through classrooms at the time of the visit. The city has a wide range of ethnic, racial and economic character to its population mix. The Follow Through program has been focused toward the economically disadvantaged.

Follow Through has been a reasonably well accepted program in the community although it has figured in some of the larger community controversies.

Parent Characteristics. Six Hometown parents were interviewed. All were reasonably active participants. Three of them had participated in paid activities in the Follow Through program, but none had been employed as formal teaching aides.

All six parents were mothers. All appeared to inhabit a socio-economic range from lower income to middle income. None was on welfare. They ranged in age. For some the Follow Through child was their first; for one it was her sixth. All had resided in Hometown for some time. Four had significant experience with children in the Hometown school system.

---

36/ Pseudonyms are used in order to avoid focusing unnecessary attention on particular site characteristics.

Two had served in school-related associations prior to Follow Through. Two had been active in other community-related associations before. All were presently living with husbands although only in one case did I meet a husband. In three cases parents had had children in Head Start before entering Follow Through.

Reactions to Follow Through. Four parents were extremely pleased with Follow Through. One felt ambivalent and one felt it was "awful". (This last mother has pulled her two children out of the program after second grade--"At points I almost wish I'd never heard of Follow Through.") When pressed directly parents identified Follow Through with a) the open classroom (a sponsor-specific characteristic) and b) the quality of specific teachers' styles. Parents were aware of other Follow Through characteristics such as the teacher aide, the sponsor, the smaller classroom census, and the additional medical and educational services, but these were not mentioned when asked what they meant by Follow Through. Favorable parents felt their child was happy, eager to learn and could develop on his/her own in the "unstructured", "interaged" environment. Most parents noted the open classroom was not of value to all children. Some gave examples of failures. Most of the mothers remembered themselves as skeptical in the early months with positive endorsement increasing over time. The dissident mother was disturbed by the noise, peer language, uncontrolled "war games" and lack of "a little bit of fear". Yet she abandoned Follow Through only when she became dissatisfied with the manner in which the program reacted to her child now labeled "dislexic". Several parents noted with approval the

added advantage Follow Through offered in allowing them some input into initially selecting teachers, in determining which teacher their child got and in avoiding some undesired teachers in the conventional system.

Awareness of Program. Most of the mothers did see Follow Through as a special program, federally funded (lavishly funded some said), designed as an experiment. Most were aware of the sponsor relationships and Bank Street by name, but beyond that were not aware of the open classroom as specific to Bank Street, the objectives of the Bank Street model or its "curriculum" or the national evaluation (and we thought everyone knew). The mothers knew the program accepted some "deprived children" and Head Start children, but neither was significant to their image of the program. Most all were readily aware of the extra services, particularly dental services which several had taken advantage of, but some mentioned they thought these services were now limited to families on welfare. All knew of the PAC and the various parent activities. Most berated the PAC as ineffectual, "a shouting match", "controlled by the [program] rules and guidelines". All of the mothers knew of educational classes and recreational activities available to them and all had participated in several of these. Generally it was noted that husbands were less aware. The apparent hostility of two husbands to the open classroom was explained by lack of understanding of the program.

Involvement in Follow Through. All of the mothers mentioned regular meetings with teachers. All mentioned they had sat in on classrooms and most had participated at least for a time in regular classroom work. All

had participated in classroom trips and group events. Participation ranged from cake baking to organizing to being paid for driving or chaperoning. Four of the mothers had served on PAC or as classroom representatives. One mother mentioned participating in a group tour to New York to visit Bank Street and other sites. All of the mothers are or have been involved in taking courses at local colleges. Generally, they liked these courses and, in several cases, were working toward certificates or degrees. Again all of the mothers were or have been involved in specific Follow Through parent classes and recreational activities including crafts, sewing, Christmas card making, child development, home affairs and bowling. Some of the mothers noted participating in Follow Through-sponsored political actions such as attending school committee hearings to protest policy changes. Finally, some mothers had acquired income-supplementing jobs including special events, driver and school bus monitor. None of the mothers noted more than cursory involvement of their husbands--attendance at parents' night or an occasional social event.

Effects of Follow Through. When asked about the effects of Follow Through most of the mothers returned to discussing their children's education. Only when the question was redirected did they arrive at rather crude analyses--"I was pleased", "I enjoyed being able to go into the classroom whenever I wished" or occasionally and with some embarrassment, specific anecdotes--about getting free dental care, free tutoring or an additional income.

B. SITE 2: NORTHVILLE

The first formal study occurred in Northville, a large town in a rural section of the Northeast. Like Hometown, Northville is a Bank Street site. Northville was one of the original thirty sites funded in the first year of Follow Through and since then it has been considered one of the more successfully administered and well integrated program. Today Northville has a total of twelve Follow Through classrooms ranging from kindergarten to third grade. The classrooms are distributed throughout the town's school buildings. The main offices and one classroom are in a separate house on school grounds. The project director reported that Follow Through classrooms contain a majority of the town's lower income children and a relatively high proportion of the educationally handicapped. Northville itself does not have a major racial minority, but there are community cleavages among the liberal middle class, the traditional Yankee lower middle class and particular lower income and welfare families, many of whom are not of Yankee heritage. Within the community the program enjoys a stable basis of support from the school board, the school system and much of the local townspeople, although in past years the program generated a great deal of hosility, particularly among the traditional Yankee sections, and the awareness of those animosities yet remain vivid in the minds of Follow Through personnel. During the early years of the program Northville had a Head Start program, but several years ago this program was moved out of Northville so as to concentrate Head Start monies in another town.

Parent Characteristics: In total ten parents were interviewd. Nine of the parents were mothers. One man was interviewed with his wife. Six were selected as major participants. Two parents were currently employed as teacher aides and two were selected as relatively inactive program participants. The parents ranged from those on welfare to those of middle income. Most had lived in Northville several years; the majority had lived there all their lives. Several of the parents had large families--six to nine children--and these families had extensive experience with the traditional school system. The local PAC is very active and most all of the active parents had had extensive experience in the PAC or in PAC-related activities.

Reactions to Follow Through. All of the parents interviewed felt positive about Follow Through. Many noted marked enthusiasm. Both of the less active mothers were very positive, although they professed little knowledge about the program. Most parent identified the program with the open classroom, more individual attention for their children and teachers who worked harder than conventional teachers. Many parents noted how their children appeared to be learning more rapidly than they remembered themselves. Several parent produced examples of their children's work as evidence. Particularly those parents who had older children without Follow Through experience noted how the younger children were advancing faster and with better social adjustment than their older siblings. In each case parents volunteered that they wished Follow Through had been available for their older children; some suggested that Follow Through might have

corrected problems which these older children now manifested. When asked whether Follow Through would be beneficial for all Northville children, all answered affirmatively, although several noted that Follow Through would not be acceptable to all Northville parents and that the freedom of choice should continue. In the early years the project director noted that Follow Through had done much recruiting, but today the program had a waiting list which more than filled out the desired population mix.

Involvement in Follow Through. Northville has a very active Parent Advisory Committee. The PAC meets monthly in a converted house which houses the Follow Through offices on the second floor. The house is imtimate and congenial with a large kitchen and relaxed funishings. Various Follow Through personnel and several parents mentioned the house as a great program asset. Parents appeared to feel at ease in the house and appeared to feel confortable in simply "dropping in" during the day. This facility stood in marked contrast to the sterile and forbidding school buildings with signs like "Visitors Report to the Principle" which housed some Follow Through classrooms.

Effects on Parents. When asked about program effects on themselves, the less active parents were less able to make suggestions. The more active parents were much more vocal. Several parents noted receiving further education. Some completed G.E.D. programs, while others went on to take college programs. As at Hometown it required some interview guidance for parents to think in terms of effects. A frequently noted benefit was free dental care. Health and social services were noted but dental care was most often mentioned and mentioned with the most emphasis. One parent simply stated that without free dental care her kids would not have received any dental care. The project director confirmed this finding noting that for many Northville families dental care for children was simply a luxury which many could not afford.

There appears to have been a strong effort at Northville to hire parents, particularly economically insecure parents, as teaching aides. Several of the aides were reported to have moved on to clerical or other positions outside of Follow Through, but the majority had remained as aides for many years. One aide noted that she has had offers to go on to higher paying jobs, but has remained a teaching aide because she really enjoys the children and the teacher she works with and feels a certain loyalty to Follow Through for all that she feels it has done for her. Several of the more active parents saw themselves as preparing now for maybe someday taking a job as a teaching aide and even someday as a teacher.

Some parents had remarkable stories. Three such stories begain with mothers sitting alone and isolated in houses up on the hills of town. Seldom would they go out. One mentioned shame and embarrassment over clothes; another mentioned her overweight figure. Each was approached by a project staff member: the social services director or the parent coordinator. For two of them it took

many months of coaxing before they would come to the school or a parent meeting. Through gentle persuasion they gradually over a year or two became involved in parent activities. The other, in heavy need of income, was offered a job as a teaching aide. She accepted the job and received training from staff members and Bank Street personnel. This woman, while working as a teaching assistant and supporting a physically handicapped child, completed her G.E.D., went on to college, acquired her A.A. degree, enrolled her handicapped child into Follow Through as a transitional step into regular schooling, and recently met and married a local widower. The other two women are active members of the PAC ("you would not believe how shy I used to be -- now I'm the loudmouth", one woman reported) and aggressively active in classroom and parent activities.

Several of the women mentioned effects within their family life. One woman noted how she doted upon her family ("I believed the woman's place was in the home -- I would never have asked my husband to do a household task."). At first she resisted getting involved in parent activities ("I was a very shy person and, anyway, I never dreamed my family could exist for a minute without me being in the house."). She remembers the social services director as the chief influence in her decision to participate. Today she is a parent coordinator ("I've even gone to New York to Bank Street. The first time I only went for a day. I just could not stand to be gone longer. The next trip I spent three days gone and my family did well without me." -- "I still believe the man should be boss at home, but now he shares some work with me."). For others Follow Through has provided a means of achieving positions they never earlier expected. One woman arrived new in Northville and became involved with the parent activities out of a desire to meet new friends. Her involvement led her to become interested in the open classroom approach and Bank Street. Soon she began attending school board meetings and becoming involved in learning about early

education. Friends encouraged her to accept an office on the PAC, from which she was elected chairperson. Soon her interests in school policy led her to run for a vacant seat on the School Board which she won and has been re-elected to. ("You might say I was a star case of the effect of Follow Through. When I first started I never dreamed I would be in this situation. No one ever expected this of me.")

Again, as at Hometown, the effects of Follow Through on parents seems primarily limited to mothers. It was often noted that fathers understood the program and supported it (although two parents remembered their husbands' early skepticism), but except for the end of the year outings or occasionally volunteering for heavy work, most of the women noted that employment precluded their husband's involvement. On the other hand there were three fathers present (without their wives) at the PAC meeting which I attended.

Generally the parent activities seemed directed toward women. The hours and subjects of some parent activities were clearly designed to be attractive to housewives. The dramatic stories of effects were all focused upon women and the project director noted that in large respect Follow Through was one of the few vehicles working class mothers had for reaching and working with other working class mothers. Northville has a local women's center, but this appeared to serve a different group of women: younger and less committed to conventional values.

Teacher Characteristics. Four teachers were interviewed at Northville. All were women. Three had extensive early childhood teaching experience before assignment to Follow Through. The other teacher was younger, had less experience and had been recruited directly from a teachers college into the Northville Follow Through program.

Teacher Effects. All four teachers were very enthusiastic about their current teaching. They saw the Follow Through program, the Bank Street curriculum support and the supplementary services as contributing to their current experience, but not central to it. In fact three of the teachers mentioned some ambivalence toward some of the Bank Street contributors, although, in general, they felt great sympathy and congruence with the Bank Street approach. The problems noted focused upon particular seminars, particular relations with Bank Street staff and particular events. Recently the local Follow Through teachers had begun to meet as a self-support group to address such problems. One teacher mentioned some ambivalence about the extra supplies she had access to as a Follow Through teacher which other colleagues did not have. All of the teachers noted the exceptional quality of the local project as a program resource. Yet above all each of the teachers noted the great value of the "second adult in the classroom", the teacher aide. Teacher aides were seen sharing most all of the work activities of the teacher. In three of the cases the teacher aide had been with the teacher for several years (three to six years) and had developed a close team-like relation which was mutually valued (I spoke with two teacher adies). Each of the teachers noted the teacher aide was the most necessary part of their current practice when asked which of the Follow Through components they would desire retained by the local school system, if the program was defunded. One teacher noted that Follow Through involved some disbenefits as well. She saw Follow Through as creating additional and occasionally conflicting elements in the traditional audience of her work. Besides responding to the traditional demands of school administrators and school system colleagues, she saw herself also responding to the interests of

the project director, the sponsor and the involved parents. While she saw benefits in this wider audience, she noted how she felt it increased the pressure to perform well. When asked about direct changes in their behavior resulting from the program, the teachers were generally vague. Most felt that Bank Street had offered great new specific curriculum ideas, but had not changed their teaching approach that much. In two of the cases the teachers were able to point out a series of teaching experiences and activities which marked out the direction of their teaching style long before Follow Through came along. For these teachers Follow Through and the Bank Street approach had simply been an excellent opportunity for them to further develop and experiment with their own particular teaching approach.

C. SITE 3: SOUTHVILLE

Southville is a medium sized city in the southeastern section of the nation. It was selected as a field site because it was recommended as a well implemented example of a University of Florida Parent Education model. The population within the Southville city limits is predominantly middle and lower income. Over 40 per cent of the population is black. In 1971 the city went through a total integration effort which now involves substantial busing. There are 35 Follow Through classrooms in the Southville public school system and they are distributed among six different elementary schools. The offices of the Southville Follow Through project are located on the twelfth floor of a modern new city hall building where a businesslike but partially paraprofessional staff administers the program. The quarters are luxurious and ring of efficiency although the staff is personable and in no way aloof.

Southville was one of the early Follow Through sites. The director and parents who selected the University of Florida as the sponsor were attracted by the parent involvement components although they were also attracted to the open classroom sponsors. Generally, the way in which the Florida model is implemented in Southville provides that each classroom has a teacher and two parent educators. The parent educators are recruited from a list of nonprofessional applicants who are screened by the school system and selected by the PAC although first priority is given to parents of Follow Through children. Each parent educator is then trained

in two week training sessions and receives continued in-service training while on the job. This training is provided by the parent educator co-ordinator which assistance form Florida personnel. The training covers many teaching skills and princip les, but centrally focuses upon the delivery of educational tasks to parents. These educational tasks are developed by the curriculum developer and teachers in conjunction with Florida personnel. A task is a goal oriented learning exercise which can be administered by parents to their own children in their own homes. These tasks are brought to the parents on a weekly basis by a parent educator who explains the objectives of the task and trains the parent in its administration. Ideally, the parent educators have a routine schedule with two days per week in the classroom as teacher aides, two days in the neighborhood training parents and one day of inservice training. Parents are persistently encouraged to come to the classroom and participate in the learning tasks there. Parents also are encouraged to participate in the "mini-PAC" meetings at their child's school, at the monthly "city-wide PAC' meetings and in an assortment of other parent activites including education, recreational and career development experiences. Special health, dental and social services are also available for Follow Through families.

Parent Characteristics. In total 11 parents were interviewed. Nine were mothers. Two were grandmothers and one was a father in a single parent household. Seven were black: four were white. All could be characterized as middle or lower income. They ranged in age and number of children. Most of the parents had little previous involvement with the public school

system other than parent visits with teachers of earlier children. Four of the parents mentioned that some of their children had had Head Start experience before Follow Through.

Reactions to Follow Through. All of the parents interviewed felt positive about Follow Through. It should be here noted that all of the interviews were arranged by the local Follow Through office and, while the parents selected ranged across the board from active to rather inactive as I had requested, I did not expect that, without a specific request, I would meet unsympathetic parents. Parents mentioned that they "loved" the program and hoped it would last forever. (Two mentioned they hoped their grandchildren could be in Follow Through--two had grandchildren in the program.) When asked what they liked most, most of the parents mentioned the parent educators, the ability to go freely into the classroom and the quality of the teachers. Many noted how much their children were learning compared to siblings; friends' children or themselves at that age. Many of the parents noted the eagerness with which their children went to school or approached the weekly educational tasks. (Several mothers noted their children running home from school eager to get at the task.) Several of the parents noted that the tasks and ability to participate in the classroom had resulted in a special closeness between themselves and their Follow Through children which they felt had been missing with their older children. Of particular interest (and it was voluntarily mentioned by four of the parents) was the parents' learning which resulted from the

task. Some mentioned learning basics of math, spelling or grammar which they had missed in school. Others mentioned learning substantive information. One mentioned learning about gardening, another about animals. One noted she watched the news on television more since she participated in several tasks concerning world events. Another mentioned a task on table manners:

> Before we just ate when we could. With four lads it was always unscheduled. They just ran in, ate and ran out. When we got the table manners task I just realized we never sit down together as a family. So we tried it. We all sat down and ate so liesurely, you know. And my husband really liked it. So now a couple of times a week we do all sit down together and just talk to each other.

Often mentioned was the ability to be treated like an equal. Similar to the Northville responses, parents appeared to see school personnel and teachers as holding high community status. Being accepted by such people on a peer basis was greatly valued. Being able to participate in classroom activities bred a certain familiarity with teachers which was greatly appreciated. In particular, the parent educators appeared as bridges in conveying this sense of personal equality. ("She's just like a sister to me", "We often talk over both of our problems together.") This sense of equality, like many other such veiled observations, often implied a race relations component. Being accepted as a peer by a white woman was significant to some black women. And inversely finding pleasure in learning tasks and sharing personel discourse with a black woman was a significant event for some white women. In particular, one white woman noted how friends warned her against Follow Through because it would mean accepting a black woman into

her house, which she had not permitted before. She proudly noted her present acceptance and affection for her black parent educator.

Involvement in Follow Through. All of the parents noted their frequent contact with the children's teachers and parent educators. Generally parent educators appeared once weekly. All of the parents noted they felt openly encouraged to participate in the classroom. Several of the parents noted they were at the school "whenever I'm not working or cleaning house". Several other parents noted they did not participate in the classrooms because the busing program, which was maintained for racial integration, meant that their children were in schools too far away for them to travel to. Two parents felt that they should be permitted to ride the school buses as well. Many of the parents noted instances of participating in school trips or school parties and such parent activities as sewing classes and physical exercise classes, but again some noted the busing problem as a limit on their participation. Much more rarely than at Northville did parents mention participating in the PAC's. The Southville PAC is organized at local schools as well as city wide, but it was not voluntarily mentioned so frequently. When asked about it, parents were aware of the PAC's and some had substantial experience with the PAC.

None of the parents was critical of the PAC, as they were at Hometown, but it did not appear uppermost in their minds. The PAC clearly functioned as an active body (the city-wide PAC was holding a meeting the night I departed) and it clearly was the central organizing unit for the letter writing campaign some parents remembered from several years ago.

One parent who had been active in a local PAC noted the difficulty in getting parents to become active participants. Simply stated, it did not appear that in Southville the PAC played the same critical role as the PAC in Northville in organizing and activating parents. In Southville the parent educator and close classroom-parent relationship played this key role.

Effects on Parents. Dramatic stories of parent effects abounded at Southville as they do elsewhere. Three parents noted previous situations of being on welfare whereas now they were employed or in school. They they credited to Follow Through. Two parents noted gaining G.E.D. certificates due to Follow Through. Of particular interest was the case presented by the one father interviewed. Left by his wife and precluded from his employment as a truck driver by the loss of his license, he decided to take hold of his life. He acquired custody of his three children and moved into public housing. Dedicat himself to his children's development, he became interested in his daughter's schooling in Follow Through and soon found himself frequently in her classroom where he manifested a talent for drawing, which endeared him to the children. The parent educator and Follow Through social services coordinator soon encouraged himto enroll in school to develop his drawing skills and to become involved in the mini PAC. Today he is pressing his education toward an art degree with employment goals as a commercial artist and he has been elected chairman of the city-wide PAC.

Teacher Characteristics. Five teachers were interviewed at Southville. All were women. Three were black; two were white. Three had had extensive background in teaching before being recruited into Follow Through. The other two had had a year or two of teaching before Follow Through, but were relatively new to teaching. Two were currently involved in acquiring more university based education. Four of the teachers had been with the program for some time. One was relatively new to Follow Through.

Teacher Effects. The teachers in Southville were generally enthusiastic about Follow Through. One teacher was "bubbling" in her enthusiasm. One had several complaints though she supported the Follow Through program and felt it had accomplished a great deal. On the whole the teachers were more reserved and "professional" in their responses than those interviewed at Northville, although the interview settings were not comparable. In Southville teachers were interviewed at an in-service workshop while at Northville they were interviewed in their school buildings. All of the teachers felt positive about the University of Florida as a sponsor and about the aid and support they received from the project director and her central office. Several of them mentioned the ease with which they had moved into the weekly task mode of organizing their curricula. Several mentioned the great assistance they felt they received from the local curriculum developer. Four of the teachers noted their use of the supplemental services, particularly the psychological testing. They reported that getting a psychological test for a child in the regular school system was much more complicated and took much longer. Of all the Follow Through features the

parent educators were considered the most valuable by the teachers. Three of the teachers noted the establishment of reasonably long term relationships with their parent educators. These relationships were highly valued as aids in classroom teaching and management and as a means of maintaining open communication channels to the parents. The parent educators were seen as providing the teacher with information about the home and family of the child as well as providing a means of sending weekly messages to the parents. The relatively new teacher was hired to replace one returning teacher and so she "inherited" two well experienced parent educators. She noted her gratitude to these two women for helping her to adjust easily into the new situation. She thought her parent educators were "just the greatest". The one teacher who did have complaints about the program mostly felt they resulted from one of her parent educators whom she felt was inadequate, but she was at the time working with the project co-ordinator of the parent educators to remedy that situation. When asked about specific changes in their teaching behavior resulting from Follow Through, most of teachers noted the task approach as significant and the parent educators as most important, although generally the teachers felt that the program had not caused them to drastically change their style.